THE CAROLINA SPARTAN.

WM. H. TRIMMIER. Devoted to Southern Rights, Politics, Agriculture, and Miscellany. $2 PER ANNUM.

VOL. XVII. SPARTANBURG, S. C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1861. NO. 50.

The Carolina Spartan.

Price, Two Dollars per annum, in advance, or $2.50 at the end of the year. If not paid until after the year expires $3.00.

No subscription taken for less than six months.

Money may be remitted through postmasters at our risk.

Job work of all kinds promptly executed.

Blanks, Law and Equity, continually on hand, or printed to order.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

The Spartan circulates largely over this and adjoining districts, and offers an admirable medium to our friends to reach customers.

FORT SUMTER.

Official Demand for Its Surrender.

LETTER OF COL. I. W. HAYNE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

WASHINGTON, January, 31 1861.

To His Excellency James Buchanan, President:

SIR: I had the honor to hold a short interview with you on the 14th instant, informal and unofficial. Having been informed that you desired that whatever was official should be, on both sides, conducted by written communications, I did not at that time present my credentials but verbally informed you that I bore a letter from the Governor of South Carolina in regard to the occupation of Fort Sumter, which I would deliver the next day, under cover of a written communication from myself. The next day, before such communication could be made, I was waited upon by a Senator from Alabama, who stated that he came on the part of all the Senators then in Washington from the States that had already seceded from the United States, or would certainly have done so before the 1st day of February next.

The Senator from Alabama urged, that he and they were interested in the subject of my mission in an almost equal degree with the authorities of South Carolina. He said that hostilities commenced between South Carolina and your government would necessarily involve the States represented by themselves in civil strife; and fearing that the action of South Carolina might complicate the relations of your government to the seceded and seceding States, and therefore interfere with a peaceful solution of existing difficulties, these Senators requested that I should withhold my message to yourself, until a consultation among themselves could be had. To this I agreed, and the result of the consultation was, the letter of these Senators addressed to me, on the 5th January, a copy of which is in your possession.

Under date of the 17th, and in reply to a letter of mine of the same date, addressed to you, I am informed that you received the Senators, and that a communication made by them, Senators Slidell, Mallory, Iverson, and Fitzpatrick, addressed to you, and your answer addressed to them, were published. These letters were received, on the 22d of January, at a time when your application, conveyed in a letter addressed to them, dated 22d, signed by J. Holt, Secretary of War *ad interim*, was pending. Of this letter you, of course, have a copy.

This letter from Mr. Holt was communicated to me under cover of a letter from all the Senators of the seceded and seceding States, who still remained in Washington, and of this letter, too, I am informed, you have been furnished with a copy. This reply of yours, through the Secretary of War *ad interim* to the application made by the Senators, was entirely unsatisfactory to me. It appeared to me not only to be a rejection, in advance, of the main proposition made by these Senators, to wit: that "an arrangement should be agreed on between the authorities of South Carolina and the States represented by the Senators "might, in a Convention, devise a wise, just and peaceable solution of existing difficulties." "In the meantime," they say, "we think (that is the Senators) that your State (South Carolina) should suffer Major Anderson to obtain necessary supplies of food, fuel, or water, and enjoy free communication by post or special messenger with the President, upon the understanding that the President will not send him reinforcements during the same period.' But besides the rejection of the main proposition, that was, (in Mr. Holt's letter) a distinct refusal to make any stipulation on the subject of reinforcement, even for the short time that might be required to communicate with my government.

This reply to the Senators was, as I have stated, altogether unsatisfactory to me, and I felt sure would be so to the authorities of South Carolina, and as South Carolina had addressed nothing to your Government, and had asked nothing at your hands, I looked not to Mr. Holt's letter, but the note addressed to me by the Senators of the seceded and seceding States. I had consented to withhold my message at *their* instance, provided they could get assurances *satisfactory* to THEM, that no reinforcements would be sent to Fort Sumter in the interval, and that the peace should not be disturbed by any act of hostility. The Senators expressed, in their note to me, of the 23d instant, *their* "entire confidence that no reinforcements will be sent to Fort Sumter, nor will the public peace be disturbed within the period requisite for full communication between you (myself) and your (my) Government," and renewed their request that I would withhold the communication with which I stood charged, and await further instructions.

This I have done. The further instructions arrived on the 30th instant, and bear date the 26th. I now have the honor to make to you my first communication as Special Envoy from the Government of South Carolina. You will find enclosed the original communication to the President of the United States from the Governor of South Carolina, with which I was charged in Charleston, on the 12th day of January instant, the day on which it bears date.

I am now instructed by the Governor of South Carolina to say, that his opinion as to the propriety of the demand which is contained in this letter "has not only been confirmed by the circumstances which your (my) mission has developed, but is now increased to the conviction of its necessity. The safety of all seceding States requires it as much as the safety of South Carolina. If it be so, that Fort Sumter is held as *property*, then, as property, the rights, whatever they may be, of the United States, can be ascertained, and for the satisfaction of these rights the pledges of the State of South Carolina you are (I am) authorized to give." "If Fort Sumter is not held as property, it is held," say my instructions, as a military post, and such a post within the limits of South Carolina will not be tolerated."

You will perceive that it is upon the presumption that it is solely as property that you continue to hold Fort Sumter that I have been selected for the performance of the duty upon which I have entered. I do not come as a military man to demand the surrender of a fortress, but as the legal officer of the State— its Attorney General—to claim for the State the exercise of its undoubted right of eminent domain, and to pledge the State to make good all injury to the rights of property which arise from the exercise of the claim.

South Carolina, as a separate independent sovereign, assumes the right to take into her own possession everything within her limits essential to maintain her honor or her safety, irrespective of the question of property, subject only to the moral duty requiring that compensation should be made to the owner. This right she cannot permit to be drawn into discussion. As to compensation for any property, whether of an individual or a government, which she may deem it necessary, for her honor or safety, to take into her possession, her past history gives ample guaranty that it will be made, upon a fair accounting, to the last dollar. The proposition now is, that her law officer should, under the authority of the Governor and his Council, distinctly pledge the faith of South Carolina to make such compensation in regard to Fort Sumter and its appurtenances and contents, to the full extent of the money value of the property of the United States delivered over to the authorities of South Carolina by your command.

I will not suppose that a pledge like this can be considered insufficient security. I—not the money value of the property of the United States in this fort, situated where it cannot be made available to the United States for any one purpose for which it was originally constructed, worth more to the United States than the property itself? Why, then, *as property*, insist on holding it by an armed garrison? Yet such has been the ground upon which you have invariably placed your occupancy of this fort by troops; beginning prospectively with your annual Message of the 4th December, again in your Special Message of the 9th of January, and still more emphatically in your Message of the 28th January. The same position is set forth in your reply to the Senators through the Secretary of War *ad interim*. It is there virtually conceded that Fort Sumter was held merely as property of the United States, which you deem it your duty to protect and preserve.

Against it is submitted that the continuance of an armed possession actually jeopards the property you desire to protect. It is impossible but that such a possession, if continued long enough, must lead to collision. No people, not completely abject and pusillanimous, could submit indefinitely to the armed occupation of a fortress in the midst of the harbor of its principal city, and commanding the ingress and egress of every ship that enters the port; the daily ferry boats that ply upon its waters, moving but at the sufferance of aliens. An attack upon this fort would scarcely improve it as property, whatever the result; and if captured, it would no longer be the subject of account.

To protect Fort Sumter, merely as property, it is submitted, that an armed occupancy is not only unnecessary, but that it is manifestly the worst possible means which can be resorted to for such an object.

Your reply to the Senators, through Mr. Holt, declares it to be your sole object "to act strictly on the defensive, and to authorize no movement against South Carolina unless justified by a hostile movement on their part." Yet, in reply to the Senators that no reinforcements should be sent to Fort Sumter, provided South Carolina, agrees that during the same period no attack should be made; you say, "it is impossible for me (your Secretary) to give you (the Senators) any such assurance — "that it would be a manifest violation of his (your) duty to place himself (yourself) under engagements that he (you) would not perform the duty, either for an indefinite or a limited period.'

In your message of the 28th inst., in expressing yourself in regard to a similar proposition, you say: "However strong may be the power. Congress, and Congress alone be the desire to enter into such an agreement, I am convinced that I do not possess, under the war-making power, can exercise the discretion of agreeing to abstain from any and all acts calculated to produce a collision of arms between this and other governments. It would therefore be a usurpation for the Executive to attempt to restrain their hands by an agreement in regard to matters over which he has no constitutional control. If he were thus to act, they might pass laws which he should be bound to obey, though in conflict with his agreement.

The proposition, it is suggested, was addressed to you, under the laws as they now are, and was not intended to refer to a new condition of things arising under new legislation. It was addressed to the Executive discretion, acting under existing laws. If Congress should, under the war-making power, or in any other way, legislate in a manner to affect the peace of South Carolina, her interests or her rights, it could not be accomplished in secret. South Carolina would have timely notice, and she would, I trust, endeavor to meet the emergency.

It is added, in the letter of Mr. Holt, that "at the present moment it is not deemed necessary to reinforce Major Anderson, because he makes no such request, and feels quite secure in his position. But should his safety require it, every effort will be made to supply reinforcements." This would seem to ignore the other branch of the proposition made by the Senators, viz: "that no attack was to be made on Fort Sumter during the period suggested, and that Maj. Anderson should enjoy the facilities of communication," etc., etc. I advert to this point, however, for the purpose of saying, that to send reinforcements to Fort Sumter could not serve as a means of *protecting* and *preserving* property—for, as must be known to your government, it would inevitably lead to immediate hostilities, in which property on all sides would necessarily suffer.

South Carolina has every disposition to preserve the public peace, and feels, I am sure, in full force, those "high Christian and moral duties" referred to by your Secretary; and it is submitted that, on her part, there is scarcely any considerations of mere property, apart from honor and safety, which could induce her to do aught to jeopard that peace, still less to inaugurate a protracted and civil war. She rests her position on something higher than mere property. It is a consideration of her own dignity as a sovereign and the safety of her people, which prompts her to demand that this property should not longer be used as a military post by a government she no longer acknowledges. She feels this to be an imperative duty. It has in fact become an absolute necessity of her condition.

Repudiating, as you do, the idea of coercion, of avowing peaceful intentions and expressing a patriot's horror for civil war and bloody strife among those who were once brethren, it is hoped that on further consideration, you will not, on a mere question of property, refuse the reasonable demand of South Carolina, which honor and necessity alike compel her to vindicate. Should you disappoint this hope, the responsibility for the result surely does not rest with her.

If the evils of war are to be encountered, especially the calamities of civil war, an elevated statesmanship would seem to require that it should be accepted as the unavoidable alternative of something more disasterous, such as national dishonor, or measures materially affecting the safety or permanent interests of a people that it should be a choice deliberately made, and entered upon as war and of set purpose. But that war should be the incident, or accident, of a policy professedly peaceful, and not required to effect the object, which is avowed as the only end intended, can only be excused where there has been no warning given as to the consequences.

I am further instructed to say, that South Carolina cannot be thus silently acquiesce in the imputation of an act of unprovoked aggression in firing on the fort of the West. Though an unarmed vessel, she was filled with armed men, entering her territory against her will, with the purpose of reinforcing a garrison held within her limits, against her protest. She forbears to recriminate by discussing the question of the property, or attempting such a reinforcement at all, as well as the disguised and secret manner in which it was intended to be effected. And on this occasion she will say nothing as to the manner in which Fort Sumter was taken into the possession of its present occupants.

The interposition of the Senators who have addressed you was a circumstance unexpected by my Government, and unnoticed, certainly, by me. The Governor, while he appreciates the high and generous motives by which they were prompted, and while he fully approves the delay which, in deference to them, has taken place in the presentation of his demands, feels that it cannot longer be withheld.

I conclude with an extract from the instructions just received by me from the Government of South Carolina.

"The letter of the President through Mr. Holt may be received as the reply to the question you were instructed to ask as to his assertion of his right to send reinforcements to Fort Sumter. You were instructed to say to him, if he asserted that right, that the State of South Carolina regarded such a right, when asserted, or with an attempt at its exercise, as a declaration of war. If the President intends it shall not be so understood, it is proper, to avoid any misconception hereafter, that he should be informed of the manner in which the Governor will feel bound to regard it. If the President, when you have stated the reasons which prompt the Governor in making the demand for the delivery of Fort Sumter, shall refuse to deliver the fort upon the pledge you have been authorized to make, you will communicate that refusal without delay to the Governor. If the President shall not be prepared to give you an immediate answer, you will communicate to him that his answer may be transmitted, within a reasonable time, to the Governor at this place, (Charleston, S. C.) The Governor does not consider it necessary that you (I) should remain longer in Washington than is necessary to execute this, the closing duty of your (my) mission, in the manner now indicated to you (me). As soon as the Governor shall receive from you information that you have closed your mission, and the reply, whatever it may be, of the President, he will consider the conduct which will be necessary on his part."

Allow me to request that you would, as soon as possible, inform me, whether, under these instructions, I need await your answer in Washington. And if not, I would be pleased to convey from you to my Government information as to the time when an answer may be expected in Charleston.

With high consideration, yours respectfully,

ISAAC W. HAYNE, Special Envoy.

PRESIDENT'S REPLY.

WAR DEPARTMENT, February 6, 1860.

SIR: The President of the United States has received your letter of the 31st ult, and has charged me with the duty of replying thereto.

In the communication addressed to the President by Governor Pickens, under date of the 12th of January, and which accompanies yours now before me, his Excellency says: "I have determined to send to you the Hon I. W. Hayne, the Attorney General of the State of South Carolina, and have instructed him to demand the surrender of Fort Sumter in the harbor of Charleston, to the constituted authorities of the State of South Carolina. The demand I have made of Major Anderson, and which I now make of you, is suggested because of my earnest desire to avoid the bloodshed which a persistence in your attempt to retain the possession of that fort will cause, and which will be unavailing to secure to you that possession, but induce a calamity most deeply to be deplored."

The character of the demand thus authorized to be made appears, under the influence, I presume, of the correspondence with the Senators to which you refer, to have been modified by subsequent instruction of his Excellency, dated the 26th, and received by yourself on the 30th January, in which he says: "If it be so that Fort Sumter is held as property, then as property the rights, whatever they may be, of the United States can be ascertained; and for the satisfaction of these rights, the pledge of the State of South Carolina you are authorized to give." The full scope and precise purport of your instructions, as thus modified, you have expressed in the following words: "I do not come as a military man, to demand the surrender of a fortress, but as the legal officer of the State—its Attorney General—to claim for the State the exercise of its undoubted right of eminent domain, and to pledge the State to make good all injury to the rights of property which arise from exercise of the claim." And lest this explicit language should not sufficiently define your position, you add: "The proposition now is that her (South Carolina) law officer should, under authority of the Governor and his Council, distinctly pledge the faith of South Carolina to make such compensation in regard to Fort Sumter, and its appurtenances and contents, to the full extent of the money value of the property of the United States, delivered over to the authorities of South Carolina by your command." You then adopt his Excellency's train of thought upon this subject so far as to suggest that the possession of Fort Sumter by the United States, "if continued long enough, must lead to collision," and "that an attack upon it would scarcely improve it as property; whatever the result, and if captured, its wound no longer be the subject of account."

The proposal then, now presented to the President, is simply an offer on the part of South Carolina to buy Fort Sumter and contents as property of the United States, sustained by a declaration, in effect, that if she is not permitted to make the purchase, she will seize the fort by force of arms. As the initiation of a negotiation for the transfer of property between friendly governments, this proposal impresses the President as having assumed a most unusual form. He has, however, investigated the claim on which it professes to rest, apart from the declaration that accompanies it. And it may be here remarked, that much stress has been laid upon the employment of the words "property" and "public property" by the President in his several messages. These are the most comprehensive terms which can be used in such a connection; and surely, when referring to a fort, or any other public establishment, they embrace the entire and undivided interest of the Government therein. The title of the United States to Fort Sumter is complete and indefeasible. Were its interests in this property purely proprietary, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, it might probably be subjected to the exercise of the right of eminent domain, but it also has political relations to it of a much higher and more imposing character than those of mere proprietorship. It has sovereign jurisdiction over the fort and soil on which it stands. This jurisdiction consists in the authority to "exercise exclusive legislation" over the property referred to, and is therefore clearly incompatible with the claim of eminent domain now insisted upon by South Carolina. This authority was not derived from any questionable revolutionary source, but from the peaceful cession of South Carolina herself acting through her legislature, under a provision of the Constitution of the United States. South Carolina can no more assert the right of eminent domain over Fort Sumter than Maryland can assert it over the District of Columbia. The political and proprietary rights of the United States in either case rest upon precisely on the same ground.

The President, however, is relieved from the necessity of further pursuing this inquiry, by the fact that, whatever may be the claim of South Carolina to this fort, she has no constitutional power to cede or surrender it. The property of the United States has been acquired by force of public law, and can only be disposed of under the same solemn sanctions. The President as the head of the executive branch of the government only, can no more sell and transfer Fort Sumter to South Carolina than he can sell and convey the Capitol of the United States to Maryland, or to any other State or individual seeking to possess it. His excellency the Governor is too familiar with the constitution of the United States, and with the limitations upon the powers of the Chief Magistrate of the government it has established, not to appreciate at once the soundness of this legal proposition.

The question of reinforcing Fort Sumter is so fully disposed of in my letter to Senators Slidell and others, under date of the 22d of January—a copy of which accompanies this—that its discussion will not now be renewed. I then said: "At the present moment it is not deemed necessary to reinforce Major Anderson, because he makes no such request. Should his safety, however, require reinforcements, every effort will be made to supply them." I can add nothing to the explicitness of this language, which still applies to the existing *status*.

The right to send forward reinforcements when in the judgment of the President, the safety of the garrison requires them rests on the very same unquestionable foundation as the right to occupy the fortress itself.

In the letter of Senator Davis, and others, to yourself, under date of the 15th ult., they say: "We therefore, think it especially due from South Carolina to our States—to say nothing of other slaveholding States—that she should, as far as she can consistently with her honor, avoid initiating hostilities between her and the United States, or any other power," and you now yourself give to the President the gratifying assurance that "South Carolina has every disposition to preserve the public peace, and since he is himself sincerely animated by the same desire, it would seem that the common and patriotic object must be of certain attainment.

It is difficult, however, to reconcile with this assurance the declaration on your part that "it is a consideration of her (South Carolina's) own dignity as a sovereign, and the safety of her people, which prompts her to demand that his property should no longer be used as a military post by a government she no longer acknowledges," and the thought you so constantly present, and and that this occupation must lead to a collision of arms, and the prevalance of civil war. Fort Sumter is in itself, a military post and nothing else; and it would seem that not so much the fact as the purpose of its use, should give to it a hostile or friendly character. This fortress is now held by the government of the United States for the same objects for which it has been held from the completion of its construction. These are national and defensive; and were a public enemy now to attempt the capture of Charleston or the destruction of the commerce of its harbor, the whole force of the batteries of this fortress would be at once exerted for their protection. How the presence of a small garrison, actuated by such a spirit as this, can compromise the dignity or honor of South Carolina, or become a source of irritation to her people, the President is at a loss to understand.

The attitude of that garrison, as has been often declared, is neither menacing nor defiant, nor unfriendly. It is acting under orders to stand strictly on the defensive, and the Government and people of South Carolina must well know that they can never receive aught but shelter from its guns, unless, in the absence of all provocation, they should assault it and seek its destruction. The intent with which this fortress is held by the President is truthfully stated by Senator Davis and others, in their letter to yourself of the 15th January, in which they say "it is not held with any hostile or unfriendly purpose toward your State, but merely as property of the United States, which the President deems it his duty to protect and preserve."

If the announcement, so repeatedly made of the President's pacific purposes in continuing the occupation of Fort Sumter, until the question shall have been settled by competent authority, has failed to impress the Government of South Carolina, the forbearing conduct of his administration for the last few months should be received as conclusive evidence of his sincerity. And if this forbearance, in view of the circumstances which have so severely tried it, be not accepted as a satisfactory pledge of the pacific policy of this Administration towards South Carolina, then it may be safely affirmed that neither language nor conduct can possibly furnish one. If, with all the multiplied proofs which exist, of the President's anxiety for peace, and of the earnestness with which he has pursued it, the authorities of that State shall assault Fort Sumter, and peril the lives of the handful of brave and loyal men shut up within its walls, and thus plunge our common country into the horrors of civil war, then upon them, and those they represent, must rest the responsibility.

Very respectfully, your opedient servant,

(Signed) J. HOLT, Secretary of War.

The Hon I. W. HAYNE, Attorney General of the State of South Carolina.

P. S. The President has not, as you have been informed, received a copy of the letter to yourself from the Senators, communicating that of Mr. Holt, of the 22d of January. J. H.

COL. HAYNE TO PRESIDENT BUCHANAN.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7, 1861.

To His Excellency James Buchanan, President:

SIR: Your reply, through your Secretary of the War Department, to my communication of the 31st January, covering the demand of the Government of South Carolina for the delivery of Fort Sumter, was received yesterday.

Although the very distinct and emphatic refusal of that demand closes my mission, I feel constrained to correct some strange misapprehensions into which your Secretary has fallen. There has been no modification of the demand authorized to be made, and no change whatever in its character, and of this you were distinctly informed in my communication of the 31st January. You have the original demand as delivered to me by Governor Pickens on the 12th of January, and you have an extract from the further instructions received by me, expressly stating that he, the Governor, was "confirmed" in the views he entertained on the 12th January by that very correspondence which you assign as cause of the alleged modification. You assume that the character of the demand has been modified, yet you have from me but one communication, and that asserts the contrary, and you have nothing from the Governor but the very demand itself, which you say has been modified. What purpose of peace or conciliation your Secretary could have had in view in the introduction of this point at all, it is difficult to perceive.

Your next attempt to ridicule the proposal presented, "as simply an offer on the part of South Carolina to buy Fort Sumter and contents, as property of the United States, sustained by a declaration in effect, that if she is not permitted to make the purchase, she will seize the fort by force of arms." It is difficult to consider this as other than intentional misconstruction. You were told that South Carolina, as a separate, independent sovereignty, would not tolerate the occupation, by foreign troops, of a military post within her limits; but that, inasmuch as you, in repeated messages, and in your correspondence, had "laid much stress" upon the character of your duties, arising from considering forts as property, South Carolina, so far as this matter of property, suggested by yourself, was concerned, would make compensation for all injury done the property in the exercise of her sovereign right of eminent domain. And this your Secretary calls a proposal to purchase! The idea of purchase is entirely inconsistent with the assertion of paramount right in the purchaser. I had supposed that an "interest in property," as such, could be other than "purely proprietary," and if I confined myself to this narrow view of your "relations" to Fort Sumter, you at least should not consider it the subject of criticism. Until your letter of yesterday, you chose so to consider your relations, in everything which you have written, or which has been written under your direction. It was precisely because you had yourself chosen to place your action upon the ground of "purely proprietary" right, that the proposal of compensation was made, and you now admit, that, in this view, "it (Fort Sumter) would probably be subjected to the exercise of the right of eminent domain".

In your letter of yesterday (through your Secretary) you shift your position. You claim that your Government bears to Fort Sumter "political relations of a much higher and more imposing character." It was no part of my mission to discuss the "political relations" of the United States Government to anything within the territorial limits of South Carolina. South Carolina claims to have dissolved all political connection with your Government, and to have destroyed all "political relations" of your Government with everything within her borders. She is unquestionably at this moment, *de facto*, a separate, independent Government, exercising sole sovereignty over every foot of her soil except Fort Sumter. Now that the intention is avowed to hold this place as a military post, with a claim of exclusive jurisdiction, on the part of a Government foreign to South Carolina, it will be for the authorities to determine what is the course proper to be pursued. It is vain to ignore the fact that South Carolina is, to yours, a foreign Government; and how, with this patent fact before you, you can consider the continued occupation of a fort in her harbor a peaceful measure and parcel of a peaceful policy passes, certainly my comprehension.

You say that the fort is garrisoned for our protection, and is held for the same purposes for which it has been ever held since its construction. Are you not aware that to hold, in the territory of a foreign power, a fortress against her will, avowedly for the purpose of protecting her citizens, is perhaps the highest, in all which one government can offer to another! But Fort Sumter was never garrisoned at all until South Carolina had dissolved her connection with your Government. This garrison entered it in the night with every circumstance of secrecy, after spiking the guns and burning the gun-carriages, and cutting down the flag staff of an adjacent fort, which was then abandoned.

South Carolina had not taken Fort Sumter into her own possession only because of her misplaced confidence in a government which deceived her. A fortress occupied under the circumstances above stated, is considered by you not only as no cause of irritation, but you represent it as held for our protection.

Your Excellency's Secretary has indulged in irony on every grave subject

As to the responsibility for consequences, if, indeed, it does rest on us, I can assure your Excellency we are happily unconscious of the fact.

I return to Charleston to-morrow.

With consideations of high regard, I am, very respectfully,

I. W. HAYNE,
Special Envoy.

A PATRIOTIC SENTIMENT.—There is nothing so much to be admired as readiness to meet the consequences of any course of action which may have commanded the approbation and advocacy of the individual. Capt. F. F. Warley, always of the extreme party, of the Darlington Guards, now on duty in Charleston, writes as follows:

"I have sometimes thought that there were beds in Carolina, which, though carefully spread, were far from being, 'soft as downy pillows are.' For one, I would, under the circumstances, much prefer the sand ridges of this uninviting island, to the comforts of home. The former are curtained by a knowledge that I am acting up to my professions, maintaining my principles, and enduring hardships for my country's good; the latter would be embittered by the recollection that I have advocated a course the dangers attendant upon the execution of which, I was willing to brave."

RICHMOND, February 13.—The Convention met in the Capitol to-day. John Janney, Esq., of Loudon, was elected President. On taking the Chair, Mr. Janney made a Union speech, but said that Virginia would insist on her rights as a condition of remaining in the Confederacy.

From the Southern Guardian.

Business in New York.

We learn from private sources that the apprehension of a general commercial crash exist in New York and Boston. Many houses, both in that city and Boston, have, we understand, already succumbed, and others will follow.

The New York papers say that rents are falling very much in New York—particularly for large stores and first-class dwellings. For the former rents have fallen one-half.

A heavy dry goods firm, which had leased a splendid marble-front building, on Broadway, for a term of years, offered the owner $50,000 to have the lease cancelled.

SAD ACCIDENT.—We regret to learn from Charleston that Mr. Clark Allen, a member of the Abbeville Company, was unfortunately killed yesterday. He was running from one room to another, and was pierced by a bayonet, in the hands of one of his companions in the eye, which penetrated his brain, causing almost instant death.

THE BREAKING UP.—Since the 6th of November, 1860, there have been one hundred and forty-five resignations in the Federal Government, to wit: Members of the Cabinet, 7; Senators, 12; Members of the House of Representatives, 30; Federal officers in the Southern States—Judges, Collectors, &c., 9; in the Army, [illegible] in the Navy, 61. A pretty rap[illegible] up; the work will go on yet fo[illegible]

THE MILITARY DESPOT[illegible] are now about one thousand [illegible] troops quartered in Washington [illegible] from all accounts their conduct [illegible] and arrogant in the extreme. Th[illegible] of the Alexandria *Sentinel* was in [illegible] ington last week. He says that on Mon[illegible] night an Alderman of the city of Washington, from one of the Western wards, on his way to attend a meeting of his Board, was made to walk around Judiciary square by one of Gen. Scott's soldiers.

Yesterday, Judge Merrick, of the U. S. Court for the District of Columbia, being a [illegible] late, started through [illegible] square, following the gravel wa[illegible] he was hopped by the sentry, and [illegible] walk around. He says that Scott's [illegible] to public houses, call for liquor, [illegible] pay is asked, present a loaded pistol.

Citizens and strangers are fined twenty dollars and costs for carrying concealed weapons; yet it is undeniable that these overbearing and irresponsible soldiers, *when out on leave*, carry concealed weapons, as one of the police officers of the city, who was stabbed, knows to his cost.

It must be grating to the feelings of an American community to have planted among them a standing army, on the most frivolous pretext. It is, however, but a foretaste of the rule of the Government that will shortly be inaugurated over them.

[illegible] OF BOMBARDING.—A letter f[illegible] en to the *N. O. Delta* gives the [illegible] gem of the expense to be incurre[illegible] siege of Sumter:

[illegible]ery gun fired from Fort Sumter [illegible] on an average, thirteen dollars. [illegible]ery gun fired by the State will be an average expenditure of nine dollars. A prominent officer of Fort Moultrie informs us that, by a close calculation, it has been ascertained that when its batteries open, the coast per diem to the State, at that fort alone, will exceed $15,000. Pretty heavy, that. But this is the surest way of mastering the fort, and we had better spend money than lives in its acquisition.

The election held last week for Field Officers of the Third Regiment of Volunteers, resulted in the election of Gen. James H. Williams, of Newberry, Colonel; Gen. B. B. Foster, of Spartanburg, Lieutenant-Colonel; and Major Jas. M. Baxter, of Newberry, Major.

From the South Carolinian.

MONTGOMERY, Ala, February 11.—The Southern Confederacy is fairly launched under the Provisional Constitution. The election of Davis and Stephens to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency gives general satisfaction. The election of Davis is owing to his military talent. It was thought important to have a man of military talent and experience at the head of the new Government. The election of Mr. Stephens was important as a conciliatory step, to entirely harmonize and unite all parties in the seceding States. He had opposed secession, but finally, in a spirit of patriotism, sustained the movement with the Georgia Convention. The new Government can afford to be generous, for it is sustained by the hearts of the people. The Congress, therefore, acted with the most consummate wisdom in honoring Mr. Stephens with this high office. This spirit should be acted on universally thoughout the new Confederacy. The past should be forgotten, and the only question asked should be who are now for the new Confederacy. Thus we will become one people.

The Capitol is now crowded with an immense throng of "brave men and fair women," and Mr. Stephens is addressing the Congress accepting his position, and pledging his faith to the new Government.

I am happy to be able to say to you that this Congress are almost unanimous against any idea of reconstruction. The determination is almost universal to *sink* or swim, to perish or succeed with an independent Government. The Mississippi, South Carolina and Louisiana delegations are a unit on this policy.

One very important benfiet of the South having the sole control of its own action, is the calmness with which great measures are considered and determined. The illustration of this is that there is no party in the Congress for the African slave trade. The universal sentiment appears to be against it.

Mr. Davis is expected here about Thursday.

SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.