

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Saturday, April 29.

The Speaker laid before the house, a message from the President, enclosing the following opinion of the Attorney General, on the right of a Foreign Minister to return money which had been advanced to him by the President as an outfit, beyond the sum appropriated by law.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Office of the Attorney General of the U. States.

After a careful consideration of the case of Mr. Adams, which you have submitted for my opinion, I think him clearly entitled to the whole outfit, which was allowed and paid to him by the President, out of the fund placed by law at his disposal, for this purpose. I think Mr. Adams' view of the subject unanswerable. The question of outfit is given to the President, exclusively, and without limit, save only that he is not to exceed a whole year's salary. In the present case he kept within this limit, and his decision was final and irrevocable. The refusal of Congress to sanction the allowance, is wholly immaterial to this question; their sanction was not necessary to consummate, either the power of the President, or the right of Mr. Adams. They were both perfect without it—they stood upon existing laws, acting on an existing fund, and not upon a fund thereafter to be called into being, by a vote of Congress. Had the latter been the case, my opinion would have been different. Were an allowance of outfit nothing more than an estimate, prepared by the President to be laid before Congress, with a view of leading to an appropriation out of which it was to be paid, then Congress would have the control of the subject, and their refusal to appropriate would overrule the President. But the fund or foreign intercourse is, I understand, an annual fund, out of which the expenses of that intercourse are paid; and it was from this fund, that the outfit allowed to Mr. Adams was drawn and paid; and, consequently, that no appropriation was necessary to give the President's decision effect.

The allowance having been regularly made and paid, I consider the subject as placed beyond the reach of recall, either by the President or Congress. It would be extremely unjust and cruel, were it otherwise. An allowance is regularly made to a foreign Minister, on the express ground of its being necessary to the additional expenses which he must encounter in his new mission, and encounters the expense on the faith of the allowance made and paid to him by the President—and when the business is all over, and the expenses have been incurred and paid, he is told that he must refund one half of the advance. I am persuaded that no court of justice would tolerate that; and I will barely suggest in conclusion, that if you think otherwise, it is practicable to make ten experiment, by ordering a suit against Mr. Adams, for the alleged balance in his hands, to which, I dare say, he would make no objection; but you will not understand me as advising this course, for I am thoroughly persuaded that the suit would fail.

I have the honor to remain, Sir, your respectful and obedient servant.

WM. WIRT.

The President of the United States.

The Message was ordered to be laid on the table and printed.

Washington, May 12.

In the Senate, the bills previously ordered to a third reading were passed and sent to the House of Representatives. The bill for the relief of Don Carlos Dehaute Dessaux, the bill for the relief of sundry persons who have lost property by Indian depredations, and the bills to amend the charter of the town of Alexandria, were ordered to a third reading. A bill was introduced by Mr. Dickerson, from the Select Committee on that subject, to distribute annually among the several States, the surplus revenue of the United States; and a bill by the Judiciary Committee, to regulate the processes of the United States Courts in those States which have been admitted into the Union since Sept. 1789.

Yesterday, in the House of Representatives, the bill for the relief of Don Carlos Dehaute Dessaux, late President of the United States, was taken up in committee of the whole, and reported without amendment. It was then laid on the table, on the motion of Mr. Ingham, with the understanding that it would be called up to-day. The bill concerning a bridge over the Potomac River at Georgetown, in this District, was defeated, by the striking out of the 4th section, which provided for the raising of the money by a lottery. The hostility which was exhibited was not to the improvement itself, but to the lottery system, by which it was proposed to carry it into effect. On this occasion, Mr. Webster took a decided stand against that system; and although the bill was zealously and ably defended by Mr. Powell, of Vir. and Mr. Thompson, of Pennsylvania, the motion to strike out the section prevailed. The bill for the relief of Mr. Cox, the Paymaster, by refunding a considerable amount of which he was robbed, was also rejected. Several bills were acted on in committee, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time to-day.

The following protest was offered on the third reading of the appropriation bill, for carrying into effect the Creek Treaty, by the Georgia delegation, in the house of representatives:

The President of the United States having submitted to the House of Representatives a contract made by James Barbour, Secretary of War, and certain Indians of the Creek tribe, dated the 26th of January, 1825, which has been ratified by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and having asked of Congress an appropriation to carry it into effect, the undersigned Representatives of the people of Georgia, feel it their duty respectfully to represent to the House

That, by a contract made at the Indian Springs, between certain Chiefs of the Creek Tribe, and the Commissioners of the United States, on the 12th of February, 1825, the claim of the Creek Indians to the land occupied by that tribe in Georgia, was extinguished, and provision made for their removal, by the 1st day of September, 1826.

That this contract was, on the 7th of March, 1826, duly and solemnly ratified and proclaimed by the President of the United States, acting by the advice and with the consent of the Senate, and that Congress, anticipating such contract, had appropriated the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars towards the execution of it. This contract partially fulfilled, on the part of the U. States, their obligation under the compact with Georgia, and removed every difficulty interposed by the occupation of the Creek Indians, to the full exercise of all the vested rights of the State over a considerable portion of her soil and territory.

That the undersigned are under the solemn conviction, that neither the President alone, nor the President and Senate conjointly, nor the Government of the United States, have any constitutional power, without the consent of Georgia, to interrupt, or invalidate, under any pretence whatsoever, the right secured to that State by this contract, made in obedience to an act of Congress, and ratified with all due solemnity.

That the new contract, for which an appropriation is now asked, differs from that at the Indian Springs in this—That it does not provide for the

removal of the Creek Indians prior to 1827, and does not expressly provide for their removal from all the land occupied by them in Georgia. The undersigned are, therefore, compelled by a just sense of what is due to Georgia, to protest, as they do most solemnly protest, against it, as violating the rights of that member of the Union of which they are the Representatives, leaving it to the constitutional organs of the State sovereignty to vindicate or to waive those rights, as their own sense of propriety, their duty to the people of the State, and their reverence for the Union of the States, under the Federal constitution may dictate.

ALFRED CUTHBERT, GEORGE CARY, JOHN FORSYTH, EDWARD F. TATNALL, C. E. HAYNES, WILEY THOMPSON, JAMES MERRIWETHER.

We are apprehensive that the Judiciary bill has fallen through, from the disagreement of the two houses as to the mode of administering the remedy acknowledged to be necessary to cure existing defects, as relates to the Western States, in the adjustment of the Constitution and Laws of the United States. The bill is not dead, to be sure; but it appears to us to have received its death blow.

David Brearly, of New Jersey, has been appointed by the President of the United States, with the consent of the Senate, to be agent of the Emigrating party from the Creek Nation of Indians.

[To the Editor of the National Journal.]

MR. EDITOR: Mr. Randolph having defamed my private character in the Senate of the United States, I came to this place in the hope of prevailing on him, by a candid appeal to his judgment and magnanimity, to retract his accusations. With this view I addressed him the letter below, instructing the friend who bore it, to assure him it was inoffensive in language, and explanatory and pacific in its object. This precaution was used from a well-founded apprehension that Mr. Randolph might object to receiving it. The gentleman who carried it made two ineffectual attempts to see Mr. Randolph; when, believing that no interview would be allowed him, he enclosed it, accompanied by a note of his own, in which the above assurance, as to the character of the letter, was made. Notwithstanding, Mr. Randolph refused to receive it, or at least to read it, and returned it by the hands of a member from Virginia. Dejected in the reasonable hope, that Mr. Randolph would condescend to hear the defence of a citizen and constituent, whom he had unjustly assailed, and repair the injury he had inflicted, I ask of you the favor to make that defence known to the public. Elevated, as he supposes, too high in rank and character to acknowledge me in any shape, as an equal, to challenge Mr. Randolph would only be to make myself ridiculous. Protected by his age, station, and infirmities from personal violence, were I to seek redress in that way, I should be called a bully of the Administration, offend national decorum, and be laid by the heels by the Senate for a breach of privilege. All this Mr. Randolph knows, and secure in his senatorial immunity, he riots in the shattered reputations of his fellow citizens. None are virtuous enough to escape his unparagoned malignity, or obscure enough to elude the blast of his withering anathema. Friendship is forgotten in the fumes of political intoxication, and female modesty itself flies, covered with blushes, from the Senate of the United States. In the same breath he scatters the ashes of the dead, and murders the fame of the living—and joins in the same denunciation, a Jefferson and an editor.

JOHN H. PLEASANTS.

TO JOHN RANDOLPH, Esq.

Washington, Friday, 4th May, 1826. SIR:—Having been absent from Richmond several days, I heard with much surprise on my return here, that you had deemed me worthy of a special censure, in your speech of Wednesday evening, on Mr. Branch's resolutions. On my arrival at this place this morning, I applied to Messrs. Gales & Sutton for a copy of your remarks, as far as I am concerned; but as they could not be suddenly furnished, and learning that you were on the eve of leaving this place for England, all I can do at present is to state the charges as they have been verbally reported to me, accompanied by such explanations as I am sure will satisfy you that you have done me injury.

I understand that you pronounced me—1st, a duelist; 2d, that I was the profligate son of a worthy father; 3d, that my press had been bought up by the Administration; 4th, that I had been disgraced by my transactions with the banks in Lynchburg, in consequence of which I had left that town for Richmond. These are the distinct charges as far as your remarks have been reported to me.

1. I abhor, sir, the character of a professed duelist as much as you can. No conduct of my life, no opinion that I have ever uttered or entertained, can justify the application of the epithet to me. On one occasion only, I was forced by circumstances to embrace that alternative, or submit to disgrace. On that occasion, the mode in which the affair terminated, by the acknowledgement of the high-minded young gentleman who was my antagonist, that he had done me injustice, is the best evidence that I had not voluntarily sought the contest. Your friend Benjamin Watkins Leigh, of Richmond, is acquainted with the circumstances, and I appeal with confidence to his statement, should you deem mine unworthy of credit. That there are situations that justify such a resort, your own conduct on two occasions of your life, for as you are to the practice, sufficiently demonstrates.

Your second charge I presume is embraced in the other three, and I will therefore proceed to the third.

3. That my paper had been purchased up by the Administration. This charge, I presume, is based upon the fact, in part, that I was deputed in 1825, to carry dispatches for the Government to Buenos Ayres. While I admit that that circumstance gives a plausibility to the charge, I do not doubt my ability to satisfy you of its incorrectness. When I asked that appointment from the Secretary of State, I told him that I desired neither emolument nor honor by it, nor was it possible by it to acquire either the one or the other. I told him further, that a deranged state of feeling made me desire a temporary absence from Virginia, and that my finances being unequal to the charge, that I should be happy to act as a messenger to the Government if any was shortly to be employed. I averred that I sought no office, and that I would exchange my business at home for no office which the Government could give me, and to which I might aspire. I have never asked any office. I never mean to ask any. I do not publish the laws "by authority," or without authority. I would not apply for that appointment when the circulation of my paper entitled me to it, because I would not incur the imputations which are lavishly dealt upon those who have the misfortune for the public departments in Washington, nor to any thing like the extent that the Enquirer does. Three or four members only of the Government subscribed to my paper; nor am I patronized, nor do I wish to be patronized in any irregular way. I support such measures of the Government, and such only, as I approve. I presume that this exercise of my natural and constitutional right of freedom of opinion and speech, ought not to sub-

ject me to so serious and disgraceful a charge.

4. That I had left Lynchburg in disguise from my transactions with the banks. Now, sir, it so happens, that I never had a transaction with either of the banks in Lynchburg. I never borrowed from either of them. I never was an applicant directly or indirectly for their favors.—This fact can be established by their records, and by the evidence of every bank officer in the town. In another shape I had transactions with those institutions, if I may call them by that term. I joined a party, who, believing the banks in that place mismanaged to the oppression of certain individuals, made annual efforts to effect a reform. As this was the weaker party, I had sacrifices to incur in joining it, but nothing in any event to gain, individually. That the citizens of Lynchburg did not consider me disgraced, is manifest from the fact of their giving me, the last year that I resided there, a unanimous vote, with four exceptions, for a seat in the general assembly.

It has occurred to me as possible, from your habits of intimacy, that you may have derived your impressions concerning me, from Thomas Milner, Esq. of Powhatan. I say not this in the way of a leading question, but to refer you, if such be the fact, to an extract of a letter from that gentleman to the editors of the Enquirer.—Having called upon those editors for the author of a piece signed Patrick Henry, in which I conceived charges to have been insinuated against my private integrity, Mr. Milner declared himself the author, and disclaimed the construction which I had put, in the following language:—"That I never alluded to you, such a charge was out of the question, and entirely disclaimed." I mention this, that if you should have derived your unfavorable impressions from that gentleman, to satisfy you that he is convinced that they were erroneous.

This, sir, have I met, and I hope refuted, to your satisfaction, the disgraceful charges you made against me in the Senate of the United States. If this effect is produced on your mind, I then throw myself upon your magnanimity to acknowledge it, and to render me justice. Our relative situations give me an additional claim to this redress. Representing the sovereignty of Virginia, known to the whole Union, placed by you as character so high in public opinion, as I cannot hope to parry the effects of your denunciation, but by your own acknowledgment, that you have spoken under erroneous convictions.—I, sir, was too obscure an individual to have deserved your senatorial reprehension; but I hope I am not too obscure to be unworthy of that justice which every citizen has a right to expect from every other citizen. I have heard that you have adopted the rule never to give explanations. But your sense of moral obligation ought not to permit this rule to make you guilty of individual injustice. To that sense of eternal obligation I appeal—convinced at the same time, that you cannot wish to destroy the fame of an innocent man. Relying upon your candor, and confiding in the sufficiency of this explanation to remove your injurious impressions respecting me, I respectfully ask, that you will make an acknowledgment to that effect, to be published in the National Journal.

JOHN H. PLEASANTS.

We regret to perceive, that in the House of Representatives, the bill appropriating \$100,000 to compensate Mrs. Deprat, widow of Commodore Deprat, and others, the representatives of those officers who were concerned in the cutting out of the frigate Philadelphia, at Tripoli, has been laid on the table, there to remain. We regret it because the claim of a debt actually due, and which ought to be paid. The Philadelphia, commanded by Commodore Baudin, with three hundred men, fell into the hands of the Tripolitans, and the crew carried captive to the dungeons. The vessel was moored under the castle, and the crescent waved over the star spangled banner. It was at this juncture, when the ship was in possession of the enemy, under protection of several hundred pieces of ordnance, that Deprat and a brave handful of men, in a little barque, disguised as fishermen, listened themselves to the frigate, sprang on board, and after a fierce and bloody encounter with the "malignant and turbid Turk," on the quarter deck, carried her at all points, drove the Turks into the sea, tore down the crimson flag, fired her in several parts, and took to their little fishing smack, and sailed off triumphantly. The widow of Deprat asks the nation to pay the gallant crew and herself, as the sole representative of her deceased husband, the value of the ship thus captured.

Had no important consequences resulted to the nation, from this successful exploit, it would still be a debt; the ship was captured, and lost to the nation; she passed into other hands; sailed under the enemy's flag and was recaptured from that enemy; repassed into the power of the Americans, who destroyed her to prevent a recapture.

Raleigh Register.

We have copied the following articles from Georgia papers, on the subject of the new Creek treaty, in order that our readers may see the spirit in which it has been received in that State. It appears that the authorities of Georgia are as little satisfied with the manner in which the Government has brought this most vexatious business to a close, as they were the last season with the conduct of the U States' Agents. It is certainly to be hoped that all excitement in that State will pass off, and that any more difficulties being created.

We hope, we will be excused for continuing our observations on the Creek Treaty; as the new arrangement seems as likely as the old, to be made the cause of much excitement in the State.

We gave in our last number the map of the Mill-ledgeville Journal, with a short remark on its incorrectness. We were then unable to find Tanner's map, from which that is professed to be taken. We have since examined that map, and find, plainly marked and lettered on it, the boundary line of the Creeks and Cherokees, of which the Journal takes no notice; although, unquestionably, the Treaty line commences where that boundary line strikes the Chatahoochee, running down the river 50 miles, and on that boundary line 45 miles west, or till it strikes the boundary line between the two States. All the maps which we have examined, and gentlemen from neighboring counties, make Gwinnett and De Kalb lie opposite the Cherokee Lands (De Kalb's southern boundary being the old line between the Creeks and Cherokees,) & placed Buzzard Roost in the Cherokee territory 40 miles above the Indian boundary line, so plainly marked in Tanner's map. In looking over the maps, we have found more places than one marked Buzzard Roost, and one on Flint river, above the Federal road. It is not improbable, therefore, that there is a Buzzard's Roost, known to the Indians, nearer the point where their boundary strikes the Chatahoochee, than the one in the Cherokee lands at the mouth of Buzzard creek. It has however, always appeared to us, that "Buzzard Roost," in the Treaty, was a very immaterial part of its description. Taking Tanner's map, then, as the best, because the latest authority, the Journal's sketch is evidently incorrect, as it involves the inconsistency of our accepting Cherokee lands by a cession from the Creeks, and evidently mistakes the point of commencing the survey as

designated by the Treaty, viz: "The point where the Indian boundary line strikes the Chatahoochee." We are at a loss to see, how the Editors of that respectable paper could have committed such an error. We repeat what we have said before, that certainly, whether we have obtained all the Creek lands within the limits of Georgia, by this Treaty, is unattainable, before the necessary lines are run, and the location of places fixed by actual surveys. Our object in the preceding remarks, has been to correct, as well as we could, what plainly appears to us to be erroneous, and to lessen the improper excitement, which the designing might produce in consequence of these erroneous statements.

C. Courier.

The New Treaty.—We are somewhat surprised to find that so much curiosity is manifested as to the course the Governor will pursue in the new posture of our Indian affairs, when on a moment's reflection, the proper course to be pursued must be obvious to every man. It is now universally known that we have what is called a new treaty. But neither the Governor nor any other man, we conceive, can admit the constitutionality of that treaty, without endangering the existence of all the treaties made in virtue of the articles of cessation of 1802, and particularly of the treaty of Fort Jackson, which was made by the very same party that opposed the treaty of 1825. Nor can any one recognize the validity of the new treaty without admitting the authority of the President, and Senate to abrogate at pleasure any treaty constitutionally ratified, for any reasons which may seem good to them. This is an admission which we believe no one is prepared to make. The validity of the new treaty cannot be recognized, because by doing so the people of Georgia must admit the authority of the President and Senate to revoke the articles of agreement and cessation of 1802—this new treaty having virtually recinded two of those articles by fixing a new western boundary of Georgia, and by guaranteeing to the Indians lands which do not belong to the United States or to the Indians, but to Georgia, the possession of which the United States government was bound to obtain for Georgia long ago. And further, we think every man must see that to recognize the validity of the new treaty would be to admit the power of the President and Senate to render null and void an act of the State Legislature founded on an antecedent treaty, duly concluded and constitutionally ratified. Where is the man in Georgia, we ask, who would make such an admission as this?

Under these views of the subject will not the Governor feel himself bound both by principle and duty to carry strictly into effect the act of the Legislature founded on the old treaty? Is doing this he will only be acting in accordance with the opinion of the last Legislature "that the title to the territory obtained by said treaty within the limits of Georgia, is considered as an absolute vested interest; and that nothing short of the whole territory thus acquired will be satisfactory, and that the right of entry, immediately upon the expiration of the time limited in the Treaty be insisted on, and accordingly carried into effect;" and further he will be acting in strict accordance with the principles proclaimed by the United States Court, under the sanction and auspices of the United States government in the case of Fletcher v. Peck. In that case it was solemnly decided that the act of the Legislature having passed vested rights, these rights could not be divested by any human power, no matter by what means of bribery and corruption the passage of the act may have been obtained. Now in the case before us, a treaty—a higher law than any act of the Legislature, or even of Congress, was concluded and constitutionally ratified, passing vested rights to a third party, entirely innocent of any fraud or corruption, or undue influence practised to obtain it. This involves precisely the same principles with that relied on as precedent, and differs from it only in the particular, that it is stronger in a tenfold degree.

The United States government cannot, we think, consistently resist this course. And as for the people of Georgia, we have too much confidence in their firmness and devotion to the rights and interests of their State, to suppose for a moment that they will refuse to co-operate entirely and cordially with their chief magistrate;—more particularly, as it is believed that should difficulties arise in the execution of this delicate and important trust, these difficulties will, so far as the United States government, and of consequence that of the State, are concerned, form subjects for the decision of the civil authorities of the country.

Georgia Journal, 16th inst.

FROM A CORRESPONDENT

New-York, May 5.—Before this time you must have heard of the Marble Manufacturing Company which recently made a blow up within the precincts of Wall-street. The history of this association is perhaps as singular a piece of fraud as ever happened in the times of speculation. A short time since, the Grand Jury found a bill of indictment against several officers of the company for a conspiracy to defraud, and yesterday the case was set down for trial at an early day. To the plain business habits of the monied men in your part of the country, the manner and conduct of the great movers in this fraudulent scheme, will present a very strange picture.

The Marble Company is a child of the N. York lobby, a mother who well known in the annals of corruption to need any specific description. The principal individual concerned, was a Canadian Frenchman, by the name of MALAPAR, who, by his intrigues and management, contrived to put the company into operation, and appoint his own creatures to the offices of the constitution. He has been indicted with the rest, but has now fled from the hands of justice.

About two or three years ago, this person kept an oyster cellar in Reed-street, where he got a living by selling to stray customers, a half dozen of oysters and a glass of brandy to wash them down. Nature, it seems, cut him out for a money intriguer, and the force of circumstances gave him an opportunity to put his talents to good account. At that time he failed for a few hundred dollars, and if report speak correctly, took the benefit of the act. Soon after this blow up in miniature, he was employed by some speculators to go up to Albany, in pursuit of several charters, and (would you believe it?) succeeded to get a charter or two through the legislature of those days. At that time, a charter was worth ten thousand dollars; they have diminished in value since.

On his return to New York, he became concerned in a manufacturing company as a stockholder and director, but was soon ejected from that situation. During last fall or summer, he set in motion another of his charters, obtained for the manufacture of marble, appointed his own president, directors, clerks, tellers and underwriters to a long train. Bonds and notes were issued at long dates, and all engines were set to work to palm them upon the community. Their object was to obtain property of every kind for those notes or bonds, and then to sell the proceeds for what it would bring. A very considerable amount of this marble paper was circulated in Canada. At first this circulation was small, but it was merely meant as a bait to catch them better. The first bills issued in Canada for produce, were sent to N. York for redemption. This being promptly done, their reputation became sufficiently established to effect an issue of an amount approaching to \$400,000. In the mean time, Malapar was living in style in New York, and superintending his various con-

cerns. Like a man of immense resources, he bought Castle Garden, and made an effort to purchase Chatham Theatre. He drove a pair of fine horses in Broadway, had his season ticket at the Opera, boarded at the National Hotel at \$20 a week, gave splendid dinners and plenty of wine to those in the secrets of the Marble Company. Occasionally, he would be seen in every public place, with his hat and his hands full of bank bills, for it appears he made as great a show for awhile as ever any man could. He had Castle Garden fitted up in a splendid style, gave a ball to his friends, and invited the Corporation to look upon the beauties of the place, and drink his health and prosperity in a glass of Champagne. This, however, could not deceive the shrewd substantial men of our city. The Marble bills and bonds had no reputation in this neighborhood, and whenever any person was forced to take them they ran to the office in William-street to have them redeemed as fast as possible. From this circumstance, the scene of his operations was principally confined to distant places, and to other persons than the poorer orders of society. In the city, the principal sufferers are the brokers and a few lottery-vendors who bought up the bonds at a discount with a view of speculating. Many of them imagined that the blow-up would be delayed awhile longer than what actually turned out. They have been bit however.

After the notice of the failure was stuck up in the window, the grand mover, Malapar, still continued to make his appearance at the theatre, public places, and every other place where he had been accustomed to be seen. On a question being put to him one day respecting his Marble Company, he said in his broken French, that he might resume operations perhaps in two weeks, but he might, perhaps two years—not certain which. He is gone, however, and it is said, he has not gone empty handed. Such an example as this, it is to be hoped, will not only mend the manners of the New York legislature in future, but be a warning for all those over the country to avoid the same species of corruption.

Courier.

New-York, May 6.—H. M. Ship Pyramus 42, and 235 tons, captain Gambier, arrived at this port a few days ago from Vera Cruz. Passengers, Mr. Morier, British Commissioner to Mexico, Dr. Maer, his Physician, and Mr. Limesurier, in the cabin; Mr. Kinlock, (house of Kinlock and Sons, Bankers, London,) Mr. Nicholas, into a Lieutenant in the Mexican Navy, in the Gun-room. The Pyramus has a large quantity of specie and colonial on board. She left England in October last, with Mr. Morier for Mexico, Sir Robert Keop Porter, Consul General to Colombia, and Mr. Tupper, Consul to La Guayra, Captain Gambier and Mr. Morier have proceeded to Washington.

Albion.

Brasil.—The editors of the N. Y. Daily Advertiser have been furnished with Rio Janeiro papers to the 6th of March, by Capt. Price, of the Tacona, arrived on Sunday, in 58 days from that port. There is nothing said of the war with the United Provinces, which augurs ill for the imperial cause. The American brig Dawn, in 34 days from Patagonia, reported, that she met with the private Lavalleja on that coast. This is the vessel which has cruized with such success against Brazilian commerce. She had then with her three Brazilian prizes, one of which was a ship from Lisbon.

We find an article on the Panama Congress, which assembly, is declared to be of vital importance to the existence of the new states; and, in the words of Mr. Deprat, transcends in importance the ancient Councils, as America exceeds Lutium and Epice.

The newspaper, "Spectator Brasileiro" is to be enlarged under the patronage of the Emperor, and conducted by Mr. Flanchar. Literary men, and two stenographers have been engaged, and during the sessions of the Legislature, it is to appear daily, to contain the speeches of the representatives. A number of copies are to be printed in the octavo form, like the "Chois des Rapports," published in France.

The secretary of state, and the political agent for Paraguay have arrived from Santaria.

It is stated that the Emperor has been received with enthusiasm in Pernambuco, and that no disturbances or signs of discontent had appeared. This, of course, was to have been expected.

About the 20th of February, admiral Rommel arrived at Rio Janeiro in the French frigate Marth Therese, in 83 days from Valparaiso. He is the commander in chief of the French squadron on the South American station. The French frigate Thetis and corvette Esperance also arrived there about the same times after their voyage round the world.

There were two or three smaller French vessels of war also in the harbour; but they appear to have assembled there without any particular object, as the last accounts from Europe represented the health of the king of Portugal as improving.

BRITISH WEST INDIES.

Montserrat.—At a late meeting of the Council and Assembly of the Island of Montserrat, a Petition to the Lord and Commons of Great Britain was prepared, and transmitted; to be presented to the house of lords by his grace the Duke of Buckingham, and to the Commons by Mr. Bernal—containing an anxious desire to surrender the whole of the property of the Island, for a fair compensation!

A letter, signed by the President and Speaker, was also addressed to his Grace the Duke of Devonshire, who presided at the public meeting at Darby, of which the following is a copy:

Montserrat, March 4, 1826. MY LORD DUKE.—A Petition from the Legislature of this Island to the House of Lords, has been transmitted by this packet, to be presented by his grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chancery, setting forth their readiness to surrender the whole of their property to his Majesty's Government, on receiving a fair and equitable compensation.

"As this seems to be the spirit of the Resolutions entered into at the country meeting of Darby on the 12th January, when the noble mover so eloquently advocated the cause of freedom and humanity, we trust we are not presenting too much in fostering the expectation that the said Petition may be fortunate enough to meet your grace's able support on its introduction into the House."

"We cannot persuade ourselves that it is the wish of the liberal and enlightened portion of the British nation, to wrest from the unfortunate, galled, and ruined colonist, the property which they hold under the sanction and encouragement of various acts of parliament, without remuneration; nor can it be the intention of Ministers, to fritter away that property, as to render it as uncertain in tenure as it is valueless in possession. If the Colonist system of Slavery, as at present established by law, is a crime, we submit, with all deference, that it originated not with the Planters; but with the Mother Country; she has received all the advantages, and if she is now anxious to wipe off that foul stain on National honor, let it not be done by a sacrifice of remote and unrepresented individuals, but at the general expense of the whole Empire at large. We trust that the importance of the question, and the universal excitement it has caused, will fully plead an apology for trespassing on your Grace's

"We have the honor to be, with high consideration, my Lord Duke, your Grace's most obedient humble servants. (Signed) "JOSEPH HERBERT, President. "W. C. FURLONGE, Speaker. "The Duke of Devonshire."