

FOREIGN.

PARIS, February 14.

Assassination of the Duke de Berri.
The inhabitants of this metropolis have been horror-struck by an atrocious assassination, perpetrated last night, at ten o'clock, on the person of his royal highness the duke de Berri. The prince attended the Dutchess to her carriage; in quitting the opera house, she was already seated, when a person passing quickly by his royal highness, encircled him with his left arm, and thrust a poignard four inches and a half long, in his right breast up to the hilt. On feeling the wound he uttered a cry and fell senseless into the arms of his servants. The Dutchess herself sprang out of the carriage and drew the dagger from the duke's breast, whose only exclamation was "je me meurs." The duke was conveyed into one of the saloons of the opera, and the nearest surgeon sent for. The Dutchess never quitted the couch of her husband. Duke of Orleans, who was at the opera arrived immediately, accompanied by the Dutchess and Mademoiselle. M. Pasquier came shortly afterwards, bringing with him in his carriage, M. Dupuytren. The surgeon bled the prince three times, and washed the wound with warm lotions.

The assassin is about thirty years of age; his name is Louvel. It appears he was one of those who went and returned with Bonaparte from Elba, and has since been employed, up to the very time of the fatal deed, in his majesty's hunting establishment.

The prince having expressed a desire to see his infant daughter, when she was brought to him in her cradle, at four o'clock in the morning, he kissed the babe, and giving it his benediction, pronounced these remarkable words: "Poor infant, I wish you may be less unfortunate than the rest of my family."

The Dutchess de Berri fell senseless when her august partner expired. She was torn from the side of her departed husband. When she recovered, she threw herself on her knees before the King, and implored him to grant her leave to return to Naples.

The assassin's name is Pierre Joseph Louvel. He has been examined before the ministers, when his replies were as follows:

Q. What induced you to commit this crime?—A. My opinions, my sentiments.

Q. What are they?—A. I think the Bourbons are tyrants, and the most cruel enemies of France.

Q. In that supposition, why did you attack the Duke de Berri in preference to the rest?—A. Because he is the youngest Prince of the Royal Family, and seemed to be destined to perpetuate the race hostile to France.

Q. Do you repent your act?—A. No.

Q. Had you any instigator, any accomplice?—A. None.

ST THOMAS, February 25.

I have only time to inform you that it is credibly reported here that the independentists have gained a decisive battle over the royalists in *Puerto Rico*, and are by this time in possession of *Caracas*.—*Morillo* had been so much reduced as to order up the trilling reinforcement of 45 men from the garrison of *Puerto Capello*.—A Danish brig of war is expected every moment from *La Guyra*.

We have received this morning the Paris papers of Tuesday. They are, of course, painfully interesting, for they communicate a variety of facts connected with the assassination of his Royal Highness the Duke de Berri. Among the most important of these is the undeniable one, that the atrocious crime was committed from political motives. This alarming truth was distinctly admitted, not only by the members of the two Chambers, who met to address his Majesty, upon the mournful occasion, but it is recognized by the King himself, in the concluding sentence of his answer to the address of the Deputies. "The Chamber cannot doubt," said his Majesty, "that feeling as a man and acting as a King, I shall adopt every necessary measure to prevent the State from dangers of which I am but too forcibly forewarned, by the crime of this day."

Quintero, Chief of the Insurgents at the Isle of Leon, in a proclamation to his soldiers, says, "In the ranks of these whom the government may assemble, you will find brethren who are united with you."

The London papers contain advices from Cadiz up to the 25th January; at which time the city appears to have been in possession of the

inhabitants, and some soldiers, having two field pieces, dismounted; had made an attack, on the evening of the 24th, upon the soldiers of the barracks of St. Helena. The King's troops opened upon them a brisk fire, which was returned for a moment: the constitutionalists soon retired, leaving 14 killed, and a great number wounded, on the ground. The captain general of the Spanish navy has given notice to the English consul, that the mouth of the river Santi Petri, (Isle of Leon,) is in a state of blockade, and that the entrance of any foreign vessel is prohibited.

Parliament.—Agreeably to adjournment, the two houses of Parliament met on the 17th, when the following message from the King was received and read:

GEORGE R.
The King is persuaded that the House of Lords deeply participates in the grief and affliction of his Majesty for a loss which his Majesty and the nation have sustained by the lamented death of the late King, his father.

This melancholy event imposing upon his Majesty the necessity of summoning, within a limited period, a new Parliament, the King has taken into consideration the present state of public business, and is of opinion that it will be, in all respects, most conducive to the public interest and convenience, to call the Parliament without delay.

The King therefore, recommends to the House of Lords to adopt such measures as may be found indispensably necessary to provide for the exigencies of the public service during the interval which must elapse between the termination of the present session and the opening of a new Parliament.

G. R."

LONDON, FEB. 17.

The Spanish insurrection, according to the most recent and best authenticated accounts, still continues to languish. Gen. Freyre, who commands the royal troops, has removed from Seville, and taken up his position close to the head quarters of the insurgents, of which, it is said, they are expected to obtain possession in the course of the present month. The leader of the mutinous soldiers has addressed a proclamation to the army and the people, in which he complains, very justly, of the tyranny and ignorance of the royal councils, and the absurdity of sacrificing more armies in useless crusades against the South American colonies; but unfortunately, he proposes no specific object in his insurrectionary movements, and holds out no prospect of any reform which he proposes to accomplish. This singular procedure, which gives to the whole rebellion the appearance of a mere military mutiny, is said to have disgusted the country, and detached many of his partisans from the revolutionary banners.

NORFOLK, MARCH 17.

Insurrection in St. Jago-de-Cuba.—Captain Doane, of the sloop *Roxana*, from Havana, states that an insurrection among the black population had taken place at St. Jago-de-Cuba, the account of which reached Havana about 10 days before he sailed. The Governor of Havana had fitted out an expedition consisting of two transport ships, under convoy of a sloop of war, which sailed for St. Jago on the 3d, and Capt. D fell in with them on the 5th off Cape Florida. Capt. D did not understand the strength of the force, which had embarked in the expedition, nor did he understand whether the insurrection was considered very alarming; but thinks it was not from the tardiness with which the expedition was fitted out.

From the Rhode-Island American.
PROVIDENCE, MARCH 17.

Melancholy shipwreck.—Captain Haraden, of the *Janus*, has politely furnished us with the following circumstantial account of the melancholy loss of the schooner *Quaker*. Captain Leonard Journegan, on her passage from Boston for the Chesapeake, in lat. 37 35, long. 73 40.

The *Quaker* sailed from Boston, Feb. 28, with cables and cordage for the *Columbus* 74, fitting for sea in the Chesapeake waters. She had on board 39 men, which had been recruited for the *Columbus*, three naval officers, and six mariners, including captain Journegan—48 persons in all. On the morning of the 6th of March, the schooner was struck by a squall, and in spite of every exertion to prevent it, capsized and the passengers and crew were washed overboard by the surge. William Miller, the mate, succeeded in hauling himself into the main cross-trees, where he found four others—the topmast and cross-trees being the most part out of water,

was holding on to the main chains, and Lieut. Samuel P. Macomber, of the United States' Navy, was clinging to the weather quarter. The mate and his four companions, remained in their perilous situation till Tuesday, the 7th, when three of them perished of cold and fatigue, and were washed away by the surge, which was continually breaking over the mate and his surviving companion, who expected momentarily to share the fate of those who were lost.

They remained without a prospect of escape from death, until the forenoon of Wednesday, March 3, when they discovered a vessel standing towards them; they contrived to hoist a signal of distress—the vessel approached within hailing distance, sent her boat, and took from the wreck the two sufferers, who, after the lapse of 56 hours, were nearly exhausted by hunger and fatigue.—This vessel proved to be the brig *Janus*, capt. Haraden, from Turks Island, of and for this port, where she arrived yesterday. The feelings of the mate and his companion, on the prospect of their deliverance, may be more easily conceived than described. They had previously been passed by four vessels, who did not observe their signals.

The proceeding particulars of this melancholy shipwreck, by which forty-six human beings unfortunately perished, are driven from a very minute statement, drawn up by the mate, and communicated to Capt. Haraden. The name of the mate's companion, who was saved, is Saml. S. Pierce, of New-Jersey, a seaman of the *Columbus*.

WESTERN SUN.

VINCENNES APRIL 15, 1820.

The following letter from Mr. Taylor discloses the duplicity of some, and vice or ignorance of others of our late Legislators. Justice demands, that the editors who published the resolution censuring Mr. Taylor, should also publish his letter, however unpleasant it may be to expose the weakness, or corruption of our representatives, or the folly and guilt of some of our scheming and sycophantic "brethren of the type" who have been so noisy on this subject.

To the Editors of the Western Sun. Gentlemen.

In the "Indiana Centinel" of the 26th of February, I observe, that my conduct for political consistency is arraigned in acrimonious terms, either by the Editor of that paper, or by some person who has written this stricture for him. I never have, nor do I ever intend, to defend my political course in a news-paper; to the people of the state I am accountable for my public acts as their Representative, and if called upon by them, or a respectable portion of them, I will always take pleasure in giving my reasons upon any subject on which they wish explanations, but to none else. If the writer had stated facts, I should have taken no further notice of what he has said, in regard to my consistency; but having omitted to do this, whether willfully or not, he can best tell, it is a duty I owe to my own character, to correct his misrepresentations. He says that "during the last session of Congress, I voted in concert with the Delegate from Missouri against any restrictions as to Slaves in the proposed constitution; and that during the present session, when that question had assumed a frightful magnitude, and when parties breast each other with as much determination as ever parties manifested, I still voted to the same effect; but at last when the question was to be decided in the senate; when each looked to the other for a firm expression of his sentiments. I suddenly wheeled about, forsook my former ground, and voted for the restriction upon the people of Missouri." Here is really a serious charge, highly coloured, and strongly urged, and if it were only true, it ought justly to stamp my conduct with *impropriety, degradation & inconsistency*, words applied to me by the writer in the next paragraph of his *impartial and temperate strictures*. But how stands the fact? By referring to the Journal of the senate last session, in page 321 and 322 the following proceedings will be found.

On motion of Mr. Talbot to strike out the latter clause of the Restriction as follows: "And that all children of slaves born within the said state, after the admission thereof into the Union, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty five years." It was determined in the affirmative, Yeas 31, Nays 7.

The yeas and nays being demanded by one fifth of the senators present. Those who voted in the affirmative, are

Messrs. Barbour, Crittenden, Dag-

Fromentin, Gaillard, Goldsborough, Horsey, Johnson, King, Lacock, Leake, Macon, Morrow, Otis, Palmer, Roberts, Sandford, Stokes, Storcer, Tait, Talbot, Taylor, Thomas, Tichenor, Van Dyke, Williams of Miss. William of Ten. 31,

Those who voted in the negative, are

Messrs. Burrill, Dickerson, Mellen, Morrill, Noble, Ruggles, Wilson. 7.

On the question to agree to the former clause of said proposed amendment, to strike out. "And provided also, that the further introduction of slavery, or involuntary servitude be prohibited, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." It was determined in the affirmative, Yeas 22, Nays 16. On motion of Mr. Talbot, the yeas and nays being demanded by one fifth of the senators present.

Those who voted in the affirmative are

Messrs. Barbour, Crittenden, Eaton, Edwards, Eppes, Fromentin, Gaillard, Goldsborough, Horsey, Johnson, Lacock, Leake, Macon, Otis, Palmer, Stokes, Tait, Talbot, Thomas, Van Dyke, Williams of Miss. Williams of Ten. 22.

Those who voted in the negative, are

Messrs. Burrill, Dagget, Dana, Dickerson, King, Mellen, Morrill, Morrow, Noble, Roberts, Ruggles, Sandford, Storcer, Taylor, Tichenor, Wilson. 16,

Thus it appears from the very best evidence, the records of the senate, that I voted against the proposition to free the offspring of the slaves already in Missouri, when they should arrive at the age of twenty five years, and for, to my mind, the best of all reasons, because I do not think that the constitution gives any such power to Congress; and I voted against striking out of the bill for the admission of Missouri into the Union, the restriction which had been ingrafted in it by the House of Representatives, to prohibit the further introduction of slavery into the state of Missouri after her admission into the Union. In what way then have I "wheeled" about, "and forsook my former ground?" My vote this year is precisely as it was the last, upon this question; in both instances I voted in favor of the restriction, and I know of no inconsistency in this business, except that the writer's assertions, charging me with it, are inconsistent with truth. If those who are inimical to me, either politically or personally, will with the candor of honorable and liberal minds, state my conduct fairly to the world, if they wish it, I can assure them that they have my hearty consent to do so; if I am guilty of what I am charged with, I never will deny it, and if by explanations I cannot justify myself, I am willing to receive the censure of the public. But I do most solemnly protest against false representations and assertions, which I can view in no other light than foul slander, the object of which is to destroy the confidence which the people of the state have reposed in me.

The official conduct of public men, I acknowledge is, and ought to be open to the scrutiny and investigation either of editors of news-papers, or any one else; but one thing should never be lost sight of in these investigations, and that is *truth*, for whenever this essential to common justice is disregarded, the charges made are no longer of the character of deserved censure for improper conduct, but slander and defamation. It has been my misfortune to have been the victim of wilful misrepresentation in more than one instance during the last four months, and some of the very members who voted for the resolution to censure me, did it upon the principle that I had voted against the restriction upon Missouri at the last session of Congress, when in fact my vote was directly the reverse. The gentleman who introduced this famous resolution in the state senate, has since informed me, that he had taken it for granted that my vote was against the restriction upon Missouri, and that he did not discover his mistake until the resolution had passed both houses, and then it was too late, as the subject was out of his reach. I will make but a single comment on this fact, and that is, that public men above all others, should understand thoroughly, if possible, the subjects upon which they act; for not only individuals may be affected by them, but often, the whole community. I do not believe that the gentleman to whom I allude, wilfully intended to do me an injury, but it is evident that he suffered himself to be led astray by others, whose motives were less pure than his own, or he

partially would have recognized the

subject more minutely, before he ventured to act upon it.

What good purpose does this spirit of wilful misrepresentation answer? It may for a moment gratify the basest feelings of the human heart, envy, malice, hatred and uncharitableness, but when it is confronted with truth, which is sometimes slow in its operations, but sure in its effects, it recoils upon the head of the slanderer, whose conscience if not too callous from a repetition of crimes, will be shocked at being detected in the base attempt to destroy, either moral or political reputation.

As to my opinions upon the policy of restricting Missouri, or any subject touching the abstract principle of slavery, I certainly shall enter into no discussion upon them, at this time, because they have nothing to do with my present purpose, which was to correct by evidence of an undeniable character, a palpable misrepresentation of my conduct. I know very well the use which designing men have made of the word *slavery*; and I know that others thinking it has lost no particle of its well tried virtue, are using it with the same view, to put down those who are in the way, to make room for themselves. But I beg the gentlemen to keep cool, and wait their turn, lest if they display too much anxiety and precipitancy, the good people of the state will begin to suspect their motives not to be quite so pure and disinterested, as they would fain make them believe. The people may be deluded awhile by empty and noisy professions of patriotism, and their prejudices may be worked upon by designing men, branding others with the epithets, of slave holder, and being in favor of slavery; and such stuff, but their good sense and penetration will soon enable them to judge correctly for themselves, and that judgment is never very favorable to those who endeavor to deceive them.

Let me conclude, by repeating my advice to certain individuals about Vincennes, and elsewhere in the state, who appear to take all opportunities to excite the public indignation against me, not to be too violent; they may over-shoot the mark; the good people may begin to suspect them, and if that should happen, some of them may "fall like Lucifer, never to rise again." I was at first a little sensitive at some attempts made to injure me, but a few moments reflection has brought my mind to a temperature, not to be disturbed by any thing which is said, provided it is true; and I can assure them that if they will confine themselves to this, I shall not notice any thing which they may speak or publish against me.

I am gentlemen,
your obedient servt
WALLER TAYLOR.
Washington March 19th, 1820.

From the Metropolitan of March 23

The Duel—Yesterday morning a duel was fought between Commodore Decatur and Barron, which has terminated we fear in the mortal wound of the former, while the latter was severely but not dangerously injured, the ball having struck his hip and glanced, was all that saved him however from the like unhappy fate of his antagonist. Commodore Decatur was supported by Com. Rogers, in whose arms he was sustained from the battle ground to his residence. Immense crowds of persons were around the house of Com. D. during the day, inquiring after the state of his wound, and the probability of his recovery. An event of this kind was so unexpected, and its unhappy termination burst upon us so suddenly, that it has occasioned no inconsiderable degree of agitation in our metropolis.—It certainly was managed with a secrecy which would have bidden defiance to the most vigilant police.—Of all the particulars relating to this melancholy affair, we have not been informed; the distance is stated at eight paces, and that both wounded at the first fire. As to the certainty of the origin of this dispute, we are not fully acquainted: it is said, that Com. Barron had demanded to be restored to his rank and emoluments; it appeared however that some representation had been made to the Department relative to his absence from this country during the war, or in other words that his absence was voluntary; which representations he supposed to have come through Com. D. This, together with some remarks indulged in by that gentleman, was the occasion of this mournful catastrophe.

We should feel deep regret at the loss of Commodore Decatur; it was he who gave that additional lustre to the star-spangled banner, which has made it shine so gloriously.—It was under his command the second naval victory over England was achieved,