

Politics of the Day.

From the United States Telegraph. AN ENGLISH VIEW OF OUR DIFFICULTY WITH FRANCE.

We invite the attention of our readers to the article below from the London Spectator. The Spectator is Ultra Liberal in its politics—Radical. It is one of the most ably conducted journals in the world.

According to the latest intelligence from the United States, efforts are making by the friends of General Jackson's Administration to inflame the public feeling against France. The speeches of the French orators in the Chamber were translated, and, with other documents connected with the subject, were distributed in the form of a pamphlet to the members of Congress last winter. They will now be inserted in the Jackson papers throughout the country. An intelligent correspondent of the Times says, that the tone of the President's message will depend upon the effect produced by these and other efforts to get up a warlike spirit. That they will succeed to a certain extent, is not improbable; but we are slow to believe that the majority of the shrewd and intelligent citizens of America will sanction a war with France, on the really frivolous grounds that are alleged.

It is absurd to suppose that the Government of the United States intended to bully so powerful a nation as France; and then on the other hand, the French King and Ministers must be aware that no apology can be exacted from the American President and Congress. A protracted war would not alter status quo ante bellum. Of this every one must be aware—more fully than the men who now administer the affairs of both nations. Why then seek to exasperate the people of the two countries? This is a question which it behooves the people carefully to ponder, before they rush headlong into a war.

It cannot be that either the American President or the King of the French suppose for a moment that benefit to either nation will result from the threatened contest. Far better would it be that the paltry twenty-five millions of francs were thrown into the Bay of Biscay, than that the struggle should last six months. But the national honor is at stake. Granted; and after a profuse expenditure of blood and treasure, where will the national honor be? The Americans will be less likely than before to withdraw the offensive expression in the President's message to Congress; the French nation will conceive it an indelible disgrace to have it supposed that they were beaten into concessions. Neither party, then, will, or can gain any thing on the score of national honor by going to war.

It may be urged that certain powerful "interests" in the United States may be benefited by a war: this view of the question is put forward by a writer in the Globe. According to Mr. Clay's Bill, the duties on foreign manufactures are to be progressively diminished, unless the revenue of the Union should require them to be increased or kept stationary. The receipts into the public Treasury since during the year exceeded the estimated revenue by about two millions sterling; and if no extraordinary outlay takes place, the reduction of the duties will probably be rapid—to the detriment, it is assumed, of the American manufacturers, who are fostered by the protective system. In case of war, there would be a stoppage on this process of reduction; the British merchants and manufacturers, as well as the American manufacturers would thrive. Thus it might seem that the latter have an interest in provoking an open rupture with France. But there are two sides to this question. A very large quantity of the American manufactured cottons are exported, principally to the South American States. This would be cut up by the French vessels of war. Almost every port on the Atlantic coast would be blockaded by the enemy. Occasionally the Americans would capture a French frigate or ship of the line, and great would be their glorification; but they could not resist a powerful fleet, such as the French Government have actually in port and at sea at the present time. We hold it, therefore, to be certain, that the American foreign trade would be most seriously endangered, if not entirely destroyed, during the continuance of a war with France.

Supposing, however, that the manufacturers would not be losers, the mass of the people must see that their interests in that case would be exclusive and anti-national. The community at large would suffer; for their trade would be crippled, their taxes, direct and indirect, augmented—very probably their unguarded sea-ports burned or plundered; and all for what? To force France to concede that which in no sensible degree can benefit America, and which it is ridiculous to suppose that France will yield compulsion.

As they have every rational motive to keep at peace with France, the American people should regard with deep suspicion the men who would plunge them into a war. The object of the war party is selfish. They look upon the war-party as one which may help them to retain office. They are willing to stop their country in the full tide of prosperity, in order to gain a partisan victory.

The same may be said of the party in France who are desirous of fomenting animosity against the Americans. The conduct of the French Ministers has rendered them unpopular with a large portion of the nation. Their domestic policy will not bear scrutiny. Some of them are therefore inclined to distract public attention by a foreign war. This is an old trick of unprincipled politicians, conscious of having deserved and acquired the distrust and dislike of the people.

At present, the trade of France with the United States, is thriving, and regularly increasing. How would the Lyonsese silk-weavers and the vine-growers of the Garonne like to have their profitable commerce destroyed, and their annual taxes augmented? It is not merely their trade with the United States that would suffer; although their own Government would probably fit out fleets which the United States may could not withstand, every sea would swarm with American privateers, as well as small Government vessels. A French merchantman would not be safe in the Pas de Calais or beyond cannon shot of Toulon. Much evil, therefore and heavy loss, would accrue to France from a war which must be undertaken, if at all, with absolute certainty that its ostensible object could not be gained, though France were twice as powerful as she is. Never could she compel the indomitable Republicans to bate a jot of what they conceive their national honor.

There is but one course for the national and truly patriotic men of both countries to pursue. They should oblige their respective Governments to make mutual concessions. This might be done with ease

and with dignity by both, did the disposition to consult the real interests of the mass of the people exist. We trust, and in spite of present appearances we believe, that the quarrel may yet be accommodated without resort to the plague of mankind—war.

From the National Intelligencer of Monday. OUR RELATIONS WITH FRANCE.

No doubt now exists that Mediation has been offered between the United States and France by the Government of Great Britain. We have reason to believe that the Executive of the United States, without consulting the Senate—we do not know that it was necessary that he should do so—has acted on this proposition, and that despatches announcing its determination are already on the way to the seaboard.

We do not know any thing of the particulars of either the proposition or the reply. Perhaps this morning's Official Journal may furnish some information respecting both. Meanwhile, lest, for diplomatic reasons, a studious silence should be observed in that quarter, we think it proper, for the information of our readers, to state our impression that the proffered Mediation by Great Britain, as a common friend, has been accepted by the Executive of the United States. Such an offer could not indeed well be declined by any Nation not disposed to place itself out of the pale of the Law of Nations.

The reader must, however, bear in mind that, between Nations, Mediation and Arbitration are not the same thing. Arbitration, accepted by both parties, would to a certain extent, be obligatory on both. The acceptance of Mediation concludes nothing between the parties; but only leaves the door open for conciliation and adjustment, through the medium of a common friend, interested, with all the rest of the world, in preventing wanton or unnecessary disturbance of the peace of Nations.

It is much, however, that intercourse between the two countries has been thus re-opened, through a channel so respectable as to furnish a reasonable security that nothing that is not respectful and conciliatory will be attempted to be transmitted through it from either side; nothing that is not worthy of the generous spirit in which this mediation has been offered by the British Government. Whilst, therefore, in the new course which things have taken, we discover no certainty of amicable adjustment of disputes with France, we see, with the greatest satisfaction, that all apprehensions are dissipated of a precipitated quarrel between the two countries.

From the Washington Globe of Monday. THE MEDIATION.

We understand that the British sloop of war Pantaloon, brought despatches to Mr. Bankhead, authorizing him to tender the good offices of the British Government as a mediator in adjusting the difficulties now existing between the United States and France. Whether any decision has been made upon this offer, or if so, what it is, we have not been advised; but we cannot but hope, that the good offices of Great Britain, in the character of a mediator, equally friendly to both parties, may be so employed as to restore that amicable intercourse which has so long existed between the people and the Governments of the two countries, without any abandonment or prejudice to the principle on which our Government has taken its stand, and in a manner satisfactory to France.

In any event, however, as a considerable period of time must elapse before the result of this mediation can be known, it must be obvious that the necessity for adopting the measures of defence recommended by the President in his special message remains unchanged.

From the United States Telegraph of Tuesday. THE MEDIATION.

The rumors on the subject of the mediation are various and contradictory. On the one side it is said positively that the mediation has been accepted to by the Administration, that it was promptly declined, "there being nothing to mediate about." This is accounted for by the fact of there being conflicting opinions among the members of the Administration. It is said, that the President, Blair, Kendall, and Forsyth, are for declining the offer;—Cass, Woodbury, Dickerson and Butler, for accepting. Mr. Van Buren, still adhering to his non-committal. His particular friends are for accepting. They calculate that, even the acceptance, they can keep up an excitement for eight or ten months longer.

THE SENATE.

Great hopes are entertained, in certain quarters, that in consequence of the recent elections of two or three new Senators, the "Party" will obtain a majority in that body—or, having a tie on the floor, can always command the casting vote of the Vice President. Admitting parties to be thus equally balanced, it will be remembered the Administration on its own measures cannot obtain the vote of the Senate. On the "expunging" resolution, for instance, it will lose, we believe, the votes of Mr. Hendricks, Mr. Tipton, Mr. King of Georgia, Mr. King of Alabama, Mr. McKean, and perhaps others.

According to our calculation, we place the Senators as follows:

For the Administration.—Messrs. Benton, Brown, Buchanan, Culbert, Ewing of Illinois, Grundy, Hendricks, Hall, Hubbard, King of Ala. King of Ga. Linn, Niles, Nicholas, Morris, McKean, Robinson, Ruggles, Shepley, Tipton, Tallmadge, Wright, Walker, Wall—24.

Opposition.—Messrs. Black, Clay, Clayton, Calhoun, Crittenden, Davis, Ewing of Ohio, Goldsborough, Kent, Knight, Leigh, Mangum, Moore, Nauclain, Preston, Prentiss, Porter, Robbins, Tyler, Swift, Southard, Tomlinson, Webster.—23.

This classification, it will be seen, omits Judge White altogether; but how the Judge must vote and will vote on all questions between power and right, is evident enough; as far as he is concerned we have no fears. But it is to be remembered that hereafter the division is not to be Jackson and Opposition—it is to be Van Buren and Opposition. Now we would ask, is Mr. McKean a Van Buren man? Is Mr. Tipton a Van Buren man? Is Mr. Nicholas a Van Buren man? We might ask the question of others. We do not believe that Mr. Van Buren will have a majority of the Senate.

It is evident, however, that a desperate attempt has been made upon the Senate, so as to convert it, if possible, into a branch of "the party." How far the action of the Virginia Legislature may go, and what course the Senators from that State may take, we do not know. We only say, God preserve the liberties of our country!—Alexandria Gazette.

LETTER OF THE HON. A. S. CLAYTON.

To the Editor of the (Augusta, Ga.) Sentinel:

The accompanying letter contains such admirable views and sentiments, that I think it due to the South to publish it. I cannot believe that the writer will have any objections to this disposition of it, and therefore I have not waited to ask his permission.

ATHENS, January 9, 1836.

DEAR SIR: You ask me for my opinion on the course of certain politicians in Congress relative to the abolition question which has recently been so warmly agitated there; and what, do I suppose, is their object? Every man who has read the late debates, and who has watched the progress of political events for the last twelve months, must have formed some opinion on the very singularly curious direction attempted to be given the subject by the professed enemies, but secret friends, of abolition. I will very frankly give you mine. I am well acquainted with Mr. Beardsley, of New York; as a private gentleman I have no right to speak of him; indeed, if I did, it would be in his favor, for his deportment is marked by a courteousness and urbanity altogether respectful and prepossessing. But as a public man, of whom it is lawful to disapprove, he is in all its parts, a New York politician of the Van Buren school. He is more devoted to Van Buren than any other member in Congress, and it is my opinion has a deeper interest in his success than any man now living, for I have no doubt some high office will devolve on him in that event. I mention these facts now, that they may be kept in view during the progress of my future remarks. You are apprized what a deep sensation pervaded the South on the conduct of the abolitionists—that it has sent a tremor to every heart and shaken the very foundations of every Southern government—in many instances it has suspended the laws—whole communities have been convulsed—the intercourse between the North and South has been interrupted—doubt and suspicion have so controlled the public sentiment, that the very charities of social life have been broken up, and safety was no where felt but in the most unslumbering vigilance and the application of the most rigorous discipline. This state of things aroused the sympathies of the considerate and reflecting portions of the Northern population, and we had their assurances that this mad scheme of the fanatics received no countenance from them. Thus rested the matter, awaiting future developments, but evidently producing a new era in the slave question, and leaving an abiding heart-felt concern for the shape it was to assume hereafter in its dark and stealthy progress.

The next place we see the monster lifting his hydra head in the Halls of Congress, the place of all others the most dreaded and deprecated, in the shape of petitions to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. These are from the very quarter where we were assured all was safe for our interest, and what is worse, they pour in upon Congress at the very beginning of its session, destroying all the harmony and sobriety of reflection necessary to the other vital business of the country, and notwithstanding the throes and convulsions through which the whole country has just passed. Had we not a right to expect that this artful destroyer would be crushed at once? Was it not due to the integrity of the constitution, the justice of compacts, the rights of the South, the faith of the North, and the peace and quiet of the whole country to ally this evil spirit at once? But instead of that, what do we find? Jurisdiction given to Congress over the subject which we have so strenuously denied, by a most deplorable treacherous manœuvre. Mr. Beardsley, the leader of the Van Buren party in Congress, expresses himself opposed to the object of the petitioners, on the mere simple ground of "courteous expediency," but that he is equally opposed to the prompt rejection of their unwarranted petitions, because it will violate, as he says, the constitutional right of the people to petition Congress for a redress of grievances! Now let us examine this right and see how artfully the constitution is to be perverted whenever the States are to be robbed of their rights by the Federal Government. This is a plain case of State rights, and I am aware its force can only be evaded by the scorn and ridicule of the friends of power, of patronage, their accustomed instruments to blind the people.

The Federal Constitution which conferred upon the people the right "peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," meant, and could mean, no other grievance, than such as Congress had a right to redress. No man can ask what another has no right to give. The right to petition implies the right to grant; for it would be a mockery without a parallel in point of ridiculous folly, to confer the right of supplication without at the same time conferring a power to relieve. Then, as the Constitution contains a definite and special enumeration of powers, out of which Congress dare not go, the right of petition mentioned in the Constitution must range within those powers—it cannot travel beyond those boundaries, because they are the prescribed limits of the jurisdiction of Congress. Within the granted powers of the Federal Government the right of petition belongs. Within the reserved rights of the States it is wholly inadmissible. Congress can no more listen to a petition affecting one of the reserved rights, than a State Legislature could do the same thing, as to one of the granted powers. What would be the course of a State Legislature to whom a petition should be preferred praying the right to coin money? Would it not, and ought it not, to reject it, at once for the want of jurisdiction? What if Congress should receive a petition asking a law regulating discounts so as to restore the right of primogeniture? Can Mr. Beardsley seriously believe that Congress is bound to entertain in any shape, even so far as to lay it on the table, such a petition, under the notion that a contrary course violates the right to petition? Now if laying a petition on the table was tantamount to a "courteous rejection" of it, there are some cases where I would have no objections to that course. The slavery question is, however, very far from being one of them; but recollect Mr. Beardsley does not conceive it to be a rejection at all; for he says he will vote to lay it on the table, but he will not vote for rejecting it—and why? He gives the reason, because it will violate the right of petition. Then as I will show you presently, this clothes Congress with the jurisdiction of the question, and we of the South are to hope for a rejection of such petitions, if rejected at all, not on the ground of unconstitutionality, but that of mere expediency. A matter of ever varying complexion, and a fit subject for political agitations through all future time, so that our peace, interests, and happiness, are to become the foot-balls of every Presidential aspirant and his myriads of dependents.

To come back to my illustrations: suppose a petitioner (and what is good as to one is equally so as to one million) should present himself in person, at the bar of Congress and ask that body to manumit all the slaves in the Southern States? Now this has been universally admitted every where during the past excitement, even by Mr. Van Buren himself, to be unconstitutional and beyond the power of Congress to grant. Well, what ought Congress to do in such a case? Would "the right to petition" authorize them to receive, and lay such a demand, for one single moment, on their table? Would it not be their duty, as well as due to us, not only as a matter of right, but more especially under the late alarming and dangerous disturbances to reject instantly such a request, and holding up the Constitution, say to the demandant, "what you ask is not within our power, because it is not within this instrument, by which alone we live, move, and have our being?" Now, we of the South contend, and have at all our public meetings so declared, that what Congress can not do directly, it can not do indirectly. If it cannot manumit the slaves in the States, it can not do so in the District of Columbia, or the Territories; for every one must perceive the former follows as a consequence of the latter, and no man is so lost to common discernment as not to see that there is as much warrant for the one as the other in the Constitution.

All this cry therefore about the sacred right of petition, is the veriest flummery—a shallow artifice, and a most hollow hearted pretence, designed by Mr. Beardsley and the Van Buren party, to evade a vote upon the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. A vote we must have, we should never rest until we do obtain it. No thinking the question. It is one which Van Buren has been asking over and over again to answer, and which he as constantly eludes, coming no nearer to a clear and definite reply, than that "against the PROPRIETY (meaning EXPEDIENCY) of agitating the question in the District of Columbia," he is opposed. And who thanks him for his inexpediency at this time? We want to close the account against all future time, if we are to live together as a united people. Does not every man perceive that Mr. Beardsley's doctrine completely invests Congress with the jurisdiction of the question? What does it amount to? He says he cannot reject the petitions, because it will "violate the right of petition;" then if they have the right to petition ON THIS SUBJECT, Congress has the right to grant or refuse their prayer at pleasure; for if the right to petition is not an idle and unmeaning correlative, it is impossible to separate it from the correlative right to vouchsafe the object of the supplicants. To confer the favor, to ask without the means to give, is too small a business for the sages who framed the Constitution.

Hence, I consider all those who voted to lay the petitions on the table, intend that Congress shall retain jurisdiction of the question to be exercised hereafter, as circumstances may require. I believe further, there was a special object in it. Van Buren is in a dilemma between the Southern people and the Northern abolitionists, and this is too well known to admit of the shadow of a doubt. He wants to please both. To say it is inexpedient to act on the subject, he thinks will please the former—to give Congress power over the question to be acted on when their strength will justify it, he hopes will satisfy the latter. The Southern members who have aided in this treacherous scheme deserve our most indignant animadversion.

A. S. CLAYTON.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND MR. WEBSTER. We can hardly be astonished that Mr. Adams has disclaimed any personal allusion, in his late speech, to Mr. Webster. He says that he merely personified a sentiment. His taunt is to be considered as a license of poetry—an effort of the imagination—a flight of fancy—without the least personal application to Mr. Webster or any one else. We are glad that Mr. Adams is thus self-concited. We rejoice that he has thus admitted the impropriety and indecency of the attack—and indicated a disposition to repent of it. Every individual can satisfy himself of the sincerity of Mr. Adams's explanation; and every one will readily yield to his disclaimer all the credit to which it is fairly entitled. Since he has been apparently disposed to judge most harshly of the motives and feelings of other individuals—it is but just to republish, for his benefit, the following extract from a letter written as long ago as the year 1814. When Mr. Adams was minister of this country at Ghent, he wrote to Mr. Leavitt Harris in Russia, under date of the 16th November, 1814, a letter from which we copy a few extracts, that may be peculiarly interesting at the present period. What will Mr. Adams say of the approach which such a writer may be supposed to have made towards joining the ranks of the enemy? We mean nothing personal. We are merely personifying a sentiment—merely indulging in a flight of rhetoric—merely displaying an effort of the fancy.

"The Defence of Baltimore"—writes the personified sentiment to which we have referred—"has given us little more to be proud of than the demonstration against it has afforded to our enemy. Prevost's retreat from Plattsburgh has been more disgraceful to them than honor-able to us, and Wellington's veterans, the fire-eater Brisbane, and the firebrand Cockburn, have kept the ravest of our militia in countenance by their expertness in the art of running away. The general issue of the campaign is yet to come, and their is too much reason to apprehend that it will be unfavourable to our side."

"Divided among ourselves, more passions than interests, with half the nation sold by their prejudices and their ignorance to the enemy, with a feeble and hesitating government, with five frigates for a navy, and scarcely five efficient regiments for an army, how can it be expected that we should resist the mass of force, which that gigantic power has collected to crush us at a blow?" It is worthy of especial comment that at this time of freedom and purity—a certain "personified sentiment" charged our exhausted Treasury and crippled Government—SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY FOUR DOLLARS FOR TWO YEARS SERVICES!

United States Bank Stock.—1750 shares were sold in New York on the 27th ult. at \$118½ and \$119. And on the 28th and 29th, 1200 shares were sold in Philadelphia at from \$120 to \$124. By the last papers from Philadelphia, we learn that there is no doubt of the passage of the bill by the Legislature, to re-charter the Bank. Every attempt to obstruct its passage in the House of Representatives was foiled by a vote of nearly two to one. It has yet to go to the Senate.

From the Knickerbocker.

French Marriages.—In the moral condition of the French capital, the bad elements vastly predominate. The effects of ambition and mercenary motives, which produce ill-assorted marriages, are generally too common and universal. Overreaching and policy are every where rife and active. He is rated as a very simpleton, who offers his gold where brass is the only currency. The young Parisian lady is kept more secure than Danae in her tower. Not even cousins and uncles, or showers of gold, that can go every where else, can approach her. Father and brothers defend her with drawn swords, and her mother never leaves her, except to pursue her own enjoyments. But apart, she is instructed most deliciously in all the arts of fashionable life. To this is referred every beginning—to this, every end. They who would play well in the concert, says Plato, must play well at home; and in what country is there a place where a woman plays off the intricate machinery of her charms with so much effect as at Paris? No one can claim any merit for resisting a well-bred Parisian lady, but at the expense of his taste and humanity, unless softened down by forty-seven, like me, and forbidden by other affections. In marriage, the preliminary wooing, that is the dowry and settlements, being discussed, the lady is led to the altar by her Mezentius. He may have (the husband I mean) the gout, chronic pangs, and every other evil, together with the incurable evil of old age; but what matter, provided he has that most desirable merit which the husband of a rich lady can aspire to—money? In the name of Diana, what is to be the effect of such an uncongenial union? Nature will assert her empire, and no institutions of man can infringe on her laws with impunity.

GRISSETTES.

If you come to Paris, you will see great multitudes every where of bouncing demoiselles, with nymph-looking faces, ruffled caps on their brows, and small baskets in their hands. These are the grisettes. They are engaged in stores, factories, and in all other sewing establishments; you see them running briskly to their work in the morning, and in the evening strolling homeward, upon wages barely sufficient for their support. They seldom marry; their conditions, and the customs of Paris generally precluding all hope of so desirable a consummation. A Grisettes never obtrudes her acquaintance—but ask her a simple question, you will find her circumstantially communicative, and such articles of information as she has gathered she will retail to you with such simplicity, that you would swear she had been brought up among the innocent lambs and turtle-doves of some rural hamlet. She is the most ingenious imitation of an exemplary woman in the world; and to overreach her, one must be a Yankee, finished off in Paris.

Never was language more happily employed for the concealment of thought, (I beg pardon of Monsieur Talleyrand,) than in the mouth of a grisettes. When sent with goods from shop-keepers to their customers, she will intrigue and wrestle for her patron as zealously as for herself. She will listen to reproaches, insults, repulses, with the most patient courtesy. As long as there is any point of defence, she pleads like an attorney-general; and there is no artifice, no rhetoric, of Cicero de oratore, that she leaves out; and if at last overcome, she "gives it up"—ille se reads, and she sets about looking sorry with all her might, till she has disarmed your anger. She dashes off the tear from her rosy cheek, brightens up with smiles anew, she winks her goods again, and then cheats you once more, by way of reparation for her former rogueries. Lavishing her affections liberally about town, her friends of course are numerous. There is next door to me a modiste of New Orleans, who came over in the same packet with me, who has some twenty or thirty of these young, industrious creatures in her room every morning. I sometimes sit an hour in this group, and from this opportunity, and the old lady's information, I have thus learned about grisettes.

GAMBLING HOUSES.

In a walk through the Rue Richelieu, a few days ago, my companion, Sir Henry L.—d, proposed to gratify me with a peep into a great gambling house—the rendezvous of the nobility. I entered with becoming acquiescence through the hall, where servants in livery attended us, taking our hats and canes, and bringing us refreshments with princely ceremony. Tables in the several rooms were covered with gold, at which many ladies and gentlemen were playing. Others were looking on with intense interest at the game. Around about, some were coteried in corners, others strolling in pairs and groups through the rooms, while others again were rambling in an adjacent flower garden, or seated in earnest conversation in its arbors.

"That gentleman," said my companion, "with an Adonis neck and myrrhill'd and glossy ringlets, is the Duke de Broglie—that is the Marquis of Braganza, from Spain—and that is Prince Caramarica." I looked particularly at Lord Brougham, who had just arrived. I could discern immediately the great truth of genius—the bitter sarcasm—the overwhelming energy—which characterizes this eminent man, in his strongly marked features. And, if I had not been introduced to him, I should have marked him at once as a distinguished character. Among the ladies, were the Princess Orleans and her attendants, and the Countess of Blacas, and others of the nobility. A Dutchess at my left, (I have forgotten her name,) had a look as haughty and condescending as if she felt the length of her genealogy. She seemed displeas'd at every body being introduced to her. But there was one, young and beautiful—so beautiful that I could not, with all my efforts, keep my eyes from her, and I observed that more than once she reciprocated my anxious glances. I felt pleased at being the object of her attention. "What an elegant creature!" thought I; "what sweetness and simplicity of expression! How strange that, brought up amid the refinements of a court, she should maintain all the innocence of the dove! No one can hope, unless by some interposition of Heaven in his favor, to know her and not to love her." In the midst of this rapture, and just at the moment when I had become enchain'd by the eyes of another lady opposite, Sir Henry dissipated the charm, by informing me that these were courtesans! The cloud burst from over my eyes, and I saw a group of the ugliest wretches I ever beheld before.

Supreme Court.—William S. Ashle, of Wilmington, William F. Davidson, of Charlotte, and Michael Frances, of Haywood county, have been admitted to Superior Court practice; and Abraham F. Morehead, of Rockingham, to County Court practice.

The important cases of Falls & Co. vs. Birchett et al. and Birchett & Co. vs. Falls & Co. involving