

The North Carolina Standard.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES.....THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C....THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1836.

VOL. II...NO. 77.
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

PHILO WHITE,
EDITOR AND STATE PRINTER.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

By NATHANIEL O. BLAKE.

TERMS.

Three dollars per annum, payable half-yearly in advance; but it will be necessary for those living at a distance, or out of the State, to pay an entire year in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid.

Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

Advertisements will be inserted at the rate of one dollar per square for three insertions. A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year. Those sending in Advertisements will be good enough to mark the number of times they wish them inserted.

EXPUNGING.

SPEECH OF MR. BENTON, OF MISSOURI.

In the U. States Senate, March 18, 1836.

The following preamble and resolution, submitted by himself, having been read:

Whereas, on the 26th day of December, in the year 1833, the following resolve was moved in the Senate:

Resolved, That, by dismissing the late Secretary of the Treasury because he would not, contrary to his own sense of duty, remove the money of the United States in deposit with the Bank of the United States and its branches, in conformity with the President's opinion, and by appointing his successor to effect such removal, which has been done, the President has assumed the exercise of a power over the Treasury of the United States, not granted him by the constitution and laws, and dangerous to the liberties of the people.

Which proposed resolve was altered and changed by the mover thereof, on the 26th day of March, in the year 1834, so as to read as follows:

Resolved, That in taking upon himself the responsibility of removing the deposits of the public money from the Bank of the United States, the President of the United States has assumed the exercise of a power over the Treasury of the United States not granted to him by the constitution and laws, and dangerous to the liberties of the people.

Which resolve so changed and modified by the mover thereof, on the same day and year last mentioned, was further altered so as to read in these words:

Resolved, That the President in the late executive proceedings in relation to the revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both.

In which last mentioned form the said resolve, on the same day and year last mentioned, was adopted by the Senate, and became the act and judgment of that body, and as such, now remains upon the journals thereof:

And whereas, the said resolve was irregularly, illegally, and unconstitutionally adopted by the Senate, in violation of the rights of defence which belong to every citizen, and in subversion of the fundamental principles of law and justice; because President Jackson was thereby adjudged and pronounced to be guilty of an impeachable offence, and a stigma placed upon him as a violator of his oath of office, and of the laws and constitution which he was sworn to preserve, protect, and defend, without going through the forms of an impeachment, and without allowing to him the rights of a trial, or the means of defence:

And whereas, the said resolve, in all its various shapes and forms, was unfounded and erroneous in point of fact, and, therefore, unjust and unrighteous, as well as irregular and unconstitutional; because the said President Jackson, neither in the act of dismissing Mr. Duane, nor in the appointment of Mr. Taney, as specified in the first form of the resolve, or in taking upon him the responsibility of removing the deposits, as specified in the second form of the said resolve, nor in any act which was then, or can now, be specified under the general denotation contained in the third and last form of the resolve, did or commit any act in violation or in derogation of the laws and constitution, or dangerous to the liberties of the people:

And whereas, the said resolve, as adopted, was uncertain and ambiguous, containing nothing but a loose and floating charge for derogating from the laws and constitution, and assuming ungranted power and authority in the late Executive proceedings in relation to the public revenue, without specifying what part of the Executive proceedings, or what parts of the public revenue, was intended to be referred to, or what parts of the laws and constitution were supposed to have been infringed, or in what part of the Union, or at what period of his administration, these late proceedings were supposed to have taken place:

Thereby putting each Senator at liberty to vote in favor of the resolve upon a separate and secret reason of his own, and leaving the ground of the Senate's judgment to be guessed at by the public, and to be differently and diversely interpreted by individual Senators according to the private and particular understanding of each; Contrary to all the ends of justice, and to all the forms of legal and judicial proceeding—to the great prejudice of the accused, who could not know against what to defend himself; and to the loss of Senatorial responsibility, by shielding Senators from public accountability, for making up a judgment upon grounds which the public cannot know, and which, if known, might prove to be insufficient in law, or unfounded in fact:

And whereas, the specifications contained in the first and second forms of the resolve, having been objected to in debate and shown to be insufficient to sustain the charges they were adduced to support, and it being well believed that no majority could be obtained to vote for the said specifications; and the same having been admitted by the mover in the face of the whole Senate, in consequence of such objection and belief, and before any vote taken thereupon, the said specifications could not afterwards be admitted by any rule of Parliamentary practice, or by any principle of legal implication, secret intendment, or mental reservation, to remain and continue a part of the written and public resolve, from which they were thus withdrawn; and, if they could be admitted, they would not be sufficient to sustain the charges therein contained:

And whereas, the Senate being the constitutional tribunal for the trial of the President when charged by the House of Representatives with offences against the laws and constitution, the adoption of the said resolve before any impeachment was preferred by the House, was a breach of the privileges of the House, a violation of the constitution, a subversion of justice, a preclusion of a question which might legally come before the Senate, and a disqualification of that body to perform its constitutional duty with fairness and impartiality, if the President should thereafter be regularly impeached by the House of Representatives for the same offence,

And whereas, the temperate, respectful, and argumentative defence and protest of the President against the aforesaid proceedings of the Senate, was rejected and repulsed by that body, and was voted to be a breach of its privileges, and was not permitted to be entered on its journals, or printed among its documents, while all memorials, petitions, resolves, and remonstrances against the President, however violent or unfounded, and calculated to inflame the people against him, were duly and honorably received, and, as a matter of course, commented upon in speeches, read at the table, ordered to be printed with the long list of names attached, referred to the Finance Committee for consideration, filed away among the public archives, and now constitute a part of the public documents of the Senate, to be handed down to the latest posterity:

And whereas, the said resolve was introduced, debated, and adopted at a time, and under circumstances which had the effect of co-operating with the Bank of the United States in the partial attempt which that institution was then making to produce a panic and pressure in the country, to destroy the confidence of the people in President Jackson—to paralyze his administration—to govern the elections—to bankrupt the State banks—ruin their currency—fill the whole Union with terror and distress,—and thereby to exert for the sufferings and alarms of the people the restoration of the deposits and the renewal of its charter:

And whereas, the said resolve is of evil example and dangerous precedent, and should never have been received, debated, or adopted by the Senate, or admitted to entry upon its journal:

Wherefore,

Resolved, That the said resolve be expunged from the journal: and for that purpose, that the Secretary of the Senate, at such time as the Senate may appoint, shall bring the manuscript journal of the session 1833-4, into the Senate, and in presence of the Senate, draw black lines round the said resolve, and write across the face thereof, in strong letters, the following words: "EXPUNGED BY ORDER OF THE SENATE, THIS DAY OF MARCH, IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD, 1836."

The preamble and resolution having been read, Mr. BENTON rose and said,

Mr. President: I comply with my promise, and I presume with the general expectation of the Senate and of the People, in bringing forward, at the first day that the Senate is full, and every State completely represented, my long intended motion to expunge from the journal of the Senate, the sentence of condemnation, which was pronounced against President Jackson at the session of 1833, '34. I have given to my motion a more extended basis, and a more detailed and comprehensive form, than it wore at its first introduction; and I have done so for two reasons; first, that all the proceedings against President Jackson, might be set out together and exhibited to the public at one view; secondly, that our own reasons for impugning that act of the Senate should also be set out, and fully submitted to the examination and scrutiny of the people. The first is due to the Senate, that all the proceedings in this novel and momentous case should be fully known; the second is due to the impugners of their conduct, that it may be seen now, and in all time to come, that law and justice, and not the factious impulsions of party spirit, have governed our conduct.

It has been seen by the reading of my resolution, that I have reinstated and adhered to the word expunge. At the last session of the Senate, I gave way to the intreaties of friends, and surrendered that word; but I had no sooner made the surrender than I had reason to repent of my compliance, and to revoke my concession. I repented and revoked in the face of the Senate. I have since examined and considered the objection with all the care which was due to the gravity of the subject, and with all the deference which was due to the dissent of friends; and upon this full and renewed consideration, I remain firmly convinced of the propriety of the phrase, and of the justice of the remedy which it implies; and being so convinced, it becomes my duty to present it over again to the Senate, and to submit the decision to their judgment.

It is also seen that the resolution prescribes a mode of expunging which avoids a total obliteration of the journal. I have agreed to this mode of executing the resolution, not from the least doubt of the Senate's right to blot out the whole obnoxious entry,—for it is a part of my present purpose to maintain and to vindicate that right; nor from complaisance merely to my friends,—for some of those who objected to the expunging process at the last session are ready now to sustain it in its whole extent; but I have agreed to it because, while it relieves the scruples of some, it pronounces, in the opinion of others, a more emphatic condemnation than a mere obliteration would imply; and because it will enable gentlemen in the opposition to emerge from their preliminary defences behind the screen of the constitution, and to come into action in the open field, upon the merits of the whole question; and thus meet my motion upon the broad grounds of the injustice, the illegality, the irregularity, the unconstitutionality, the error of fact, and the whole gross wrong, of the proceeding against the President, which it is my purpose to expose and to correct.

The objection to this word expunge, is founded upon that clause in the constitution which directs each House of Congress "to keep a journal of its proceedings."—The word keep is the pregnant point of the objection. Gentlemen take a position in the rear of that word; and out of the numerous and diverse meanings attributed to it by lexicographers, and exemplified by daily usage, they select one, and shutting their eyes upon all other meanings, they rest the whole strength of the objection upon the propriety of that single selection. They take the word in the sense of preserve; and, adhering to that sense, they assume that the Senate is constitutionally commanded to preserve its journals, and that no part of them can be defaced or al-

tered without disregarding the authority of that injunction. I am free to admit that to preserve, is one of the meanings of the verb to keep; but I must be permitted to affirm that it is one meaning only, out of three or four dozen meanings which belong to that phrase, and which every Senator's recollection will readily recall to his mind. It is needless to thread the labyrinth of all these meanings, and to show by multiplied dictionary quotations in how many instances the verb, to keep, displays a signification, entirely foreign, and even contradictory to the idea of preserving.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate the position, and to bring many other instances to the recollection of Senators.—Thus: to keep up, is to maintain; to keep under, is to oppress; to keep house, is to eat and sleep at home; to keep the door, is to let people in and out; to keep company, is to frequent one; to keep a mill is to grind grain; to keep store, is to sell goods; to keep a public house, is to sell entertainment; to keep bar, is to sell liquor; to keep a diary, is to write a daily history of what you do; and to keep a journal is the same thing. It is to make a journal; and the phrase has the same meaning in the constitution that it has in common parlance.

When we direct a person in our employment to keep a journal, we direct him to make one; our intention is that he shall make one, and not that he shall preserve an old one already made by somebody else; and this is the precise meaning of the phrase in the constitution. That it is so, is clear, not only from the sense and reason of the injunction, but from the words which follow next after; and from time to time publish the same except such parts as in their judgement require secrecy.

This injunction to publish, follows, immediately after the injunction to keep; it is a part of the same sentence, and can only apply to makers of the journal. They are to keep a journal, and to publish the same. Which sense? the new one made by themselves, or the old one made by their predecessors? Certainly they are to publish their own, which they are daily making, and not the one which was both made and published by a former Congress; and in this sense has the injunction been understood and acted upon by the two Houses from the date of their existence.

Again: if this injunction is to be interpreted to signify preserve, and we are to be sunk to the condition of mere keepers of the old journals, where is the injunction for making new ones? Where is the injunction under which our Secretary is now acting in writing down a history of your proceedings on this my present motion. There is nothing else in the constitution upon the subject. There is no other clause directing a journal to be made; and if this interpretation is to prevail, then the absurdity prevails of having an injunction to save what there is no injunction to create!—the absurdity of having each successive Congress bound to preserve the journals of its predecessors, while neither its predecessors, nor itself, is required to make any journal whatever.

Again: if the Houses are to be the preservers, and not the makers of journals, then a most inadequate keeper is provided; for during one half the time the two Houses are not in session, the keepers are not in existence, for the Secretary is not the House, and during all that moiety of time there can be no keeper of this thing which is to be kept all the time.

Again: if to keep the journal is to save old ones, and not to make new ones, then the constitutional injunction could have had no application to the first session of the first Congress; for the two Houses, during that session, had no pre-existing journal in their possession, whereof to become the constitutional keepers.

There are but two injunctions in the constitution on the subject of the journal; one to make it, the other to publish it; and both are found in the same clause.—There is no specific command to preserve it; there is no keeper provided to stand guard over it. The House is not the keeper, and never has been, and never can be. The Secretary and the Clerk are the keepers, and they are not the Houses. The only preservation provided for is their custody and the publication; and that is the most effectual, and in fact, the only safe preserver. What is published, is preserved, though no one is appointed to keep it; what is not published is often lost, though committed to the custody of special guardians.

I have examined this word upon its literal meanings as a verbal critic would do it; but I am bound to examine it practically, as a statesman should see it, and as the framers of the constitution used it. Those wise men did not invent phrases, but adopted them, and used them in the sense known and accepted by the community; law terms, as understood in the courts; technical, as known in science; parliamentary, as known in legislation; and familiar phrases, as used by the people.—Strong examples of this occur twice more in the very clause which we have been examining. There is the word house, "each house shall keep." &c. Here the word house is used in the parliamentary sense, and means, not stone and mortar, but people, and not people generally, but the representatives of the people, and these representatives organized for action. Yet, with a dictionary in hand, the word House might be shown to be the habitation, and not the inhabitants; and the walls and roof of this capital might be proved to have received the injunction of the constitution to

keep a journal. Again: the House is directed to publish the journal, and under that injunction the journal is printed; because the popular sense of publishing is printing; while the legal sense is a mere discovery of its contents in any manner whatever. The reading of the journal at the Secretary's table every morning, the leaving it open in his office for the inspection of the public, is a publication in law; and this legal publication would comply with the letter of the constitution. But the common sense men who framed the constitution used the word in its popular sense, as synonymous with printing; and in that sense it has been understood and executed by Congress. Of this phrase to keep a journal: the framers of the constitution found it in English legislation, in English history, and in English life, and they used it as they found it.

The traveller keeps a journal of his voyage; the natural philosopher of his experiments; the Parliament of its proceedings; and in every case the meaning of the phrase is the same. Our constitution adopts the phrase without defining it, and of course adopts it in the sense in which it was known in the language from which it was borrowed. So of the word proceedings; it is technical, and no person who has not studied parliamentary law can tell what it includes. Both in England and America rules have been adopted to define these proceedings, and great mistakes have been made by Senators in acting under the orders of the Senate in relation to proceedings in executive session. Grave debates have taken place among ourselves to know what fell under the definition of proceedings, and how far Senators may have mistaken the import of an order removing the injunction of secrecy from the Senate's proceedings.

Every word in this short clause has a parliamentary sense in which it must be understood; House,—keep,—publish,—proceedings,—all are parliamentary terms as here used; and must be construed by statesmen with the book of parliamentary history spread before them, and not by verbal critics with Entick's pocket dictionary in their hand.

Mr. President, we have borrowed largely from our English ancestors, and because we have so borrowed, results the precious and proud gratification that our America now ranks among the great and liberal powers of the world. We have borrowed largely from them; but not to enter upon a field which presents inexhaustible topics, I limit myself to the precise question before the Senate. Then, sir, I say, we have borrowed from England the idea of this Congress,—its two Houses,—their organization,—their forms of proceedings,—the laws for their government,—and the general scope of the powers and of the duties,—with the very words and phrases which define every thing; and so clear and absolute is all this, that whenever altered or modified by our own constitution, our own laws, and our own rules, the British parliamentary law is the law to our Congress, and as such is read, quoted, and enforced every day.

The English constitution requires a Parliament, a Parliament of two Houses; and it requires each House to keep a journal of its proceedings; and that duty has been performed with a fidelity, a jealousy, a care, and a courage which shows them to have been as vigilant and as faithful in the preservation of their journals as we can ever be. The pages of their journals are traced back in a continuous line to the reign of Edward the Sixth. The clerk of the English House of Commons was the keeper of the journal, and he took an oath "to make entries, remembrances, and journals, of the things done and passed in the House of Commons." As far back as 1641, the clerk was moved against suffering his journals, or papers committed to his trust, to be taken by members of the House from the table, and it was declared, "that it was a fundamental order of the House that the clerk, who is the sworn officer, and entrusted with the entries and the custody of the records of the House, ought not to suffer any journal or record to be taken from the table, or out of his custody, and that if he shall hereafter do it, after this warning, that at his peril he shall do it."

Many instances occur in the parliamentary history of England, of severe reprimands upon members for slight and innocent alterations in the journals, and merely to make them conformable to the fact; the House of Commons permitting none but the House itself to meddle with the journal; and when King James the First sent for the journal and tore out of it the celebrated declaration of their privileges, which the commons had made, the House took effectual care that that declaration should be better known, and should be held the more sacred, for that very attempt to annihilate it. And, to comprise the whole in one word, and to show the reverence which the English Parliament had for their journals, the two Houses, as far back as the reign of Henry the Sixth, by act of Parliament, affirmed them to be records, and compelled the judges to recognize them as such. (Sir Edward Coke in 4 Inst. 23, 24.) This suffices to show the high and sacred character of their journals in the eyes of the English Parliament; but this high and sacred character did not prevent the two Houses, each in its sphere, from rectifying any mistake in the journal, or expunging from it by total obliteration, any entry that was unconstitutional, or untrue in law or

in fact, or unfit to be drawn into future precedent. The business of rectifying mistaken or erroneous entries in the journals, is as old as the journals themselves. The rectification is made by a committee appointed to inquire into the facts, and to report them to the House; and there is no limitation of time upon these inquiries. Instances occur in which the erroneous entry has been corrected four years after the mistake had occurred. The expunction or expurgation of the journal, and that by total obliteration, of any improper matter put into it, is as early at least in England, as Lord Strafford's case in the reign of Charles the First, and as late as the Middlesex election case in the reign of George the Third. I have found no instance in which the right, or the power of the House to expunge has been questioned. I have seen no instance in which the duty to keep a journal of its proceedings, has been set up in opposition to any motion to expunge unfit matter from the journal; and therefore I hold it to be the settled law of Parliament that each House has power over its own journal, both to correct it, and to efface objectionable matter from it. And this, Mr. President, brings me to the law of Congress, and the power of the two Houses over their journals. What is the law of Congress in regard to its powers and duties? It is the *Lex Parliamentaria*—it is the law of Parliament, except where changed, or modified, by ourselves! This is so entirely the case, that every book that we have on Parliamentary Law, is in English! We have not a book on the subject, nor even a treatise; nothing but the *Manual* of Mr. Jefferson, which is in itself an abstract from the English books, with the changes and modifications made by our rules and constitution. Our whole code of parliamentary law is English; and who ever wishes to understand it, goes to the four quarto volumes of Haysell, and the less voluminous compilations of Grey, Elysnge, and Dewes. Mr. Jefferson's *Manual* is little more than an index to these books, and is so declared by himself, and intended to supply, in a slight degree, the want of those books in this country. His own words in his preface, and the authority of English parliamentary practice, were not controlled by our own rules and constitution, will be too instructive on this occasion to be omitted, and I shall accordingly read a passage from the preface to his *Manual*:

"Considering, therefore, the law of proceedings in the Senate as composed of the precepts of the constitution, the regulations of the Senate, and, when these are silent, of the rules of Parliament, I have endeavored to collect and digest so much of these as is called for in ordinary practice, collating the Parliamentary with the Senatorial rules, both where they agree and where they vary. I have done this, as well to have them at hand for my own government, as to deposit with the Senate the standard by which I judge, and am willing to be judged. I could not doubt the necessity of quoting the sources of my information; among which, Mr. Haysell's most valuable book is pre-eminent; but as he has only treated some general heads, I have been obliged to recur to other authorities in support of a number of common rules of practice, to which his plan did not descend."

The authority of the English parliamentary laws is here recognized, and brought into action over the Senate in every case in which the precepts of the constitution and the rules of the Senate are silent; and on the head of expunging both are silent; the English parliamentary law, therefore, takes effect. It is to no purpose that gentlemen may recur to that poor little word, keep, it is in the English constitution, and in the English parliamentary law, as much as it is in ours. But no one in England ever thought of that word except as an injunction to make a journal. No one ever thought of it as constituting the House of Commons, or the House of Lords, the *custos*, keeper, or preserver of the journals; an office which cannot be performed by a collective body; but there is here, and in law as well as in fact, the Secretary and the Clerk are the keepers of the history of their proceedings which the two houses cause to be daily written. And thus I hold that the right of expunging even to entire obliteration, is completely made out; of course that there can be no objection to the mode of expunging now proposed; a mode that saves the remedy and avoids the objection, and effectually expunges without the least obliteration.

Thus far, Mr. President, I have examined this objection in a mere verbal point of view, and shown that there is nothing in it, even in that contracted aspect, to prevent the Senate from executing justice upon this journal. But gentlemen who brought it forward did not limit themselves to that narrow view; they took a wider range, and argued earnestly that mischievous consequences would result, and actual injury would be inflicted on themselves and the country, if my motion should prevail. They maintained that a part of our legislative history would be destroyed; that a part of the journal would be annihilated; that the proceedings contained in the annihilated part would be lost to the public and to posterity that their own proceedings would become illegible, that they would be deprived of the means of showing what they did, and how they acted. All these disastrous consequences, and all these actual wrongs and serious injuries to themselves and to the public, they stoutly maintained, would fall upon them if the proposed obliteration on the journal took place. And they affirmed that it was no answer to all these real injuries to say that the expunged part would be transferred to the new journal and there preserved in full,

for, they declared, this transfer would mislead and embarrass them, because they could not read the obliterated words in the place where they were first put, but would be disappointed, in looking for them there, and might not be able to find them in their new place, under a different date, on another page, and in a different volume.—This is the substantive part of the objection to my motion; and if there happened to be any reality in the supposed existence of all these wrongs and injuries, there might be some apology for the resistance they set up; but this is not the case; not one of these disastrous consequences will ever occur. All is a mistake and delusion, the creation of fancy, the cheat of imagination and the figment of the brain. There will be nothing lost, nothing destroyed, nothing displaced. All will exist just as usefully, for every practical and every legal purpose, as it now does; and this I will establish by proof in less time than it has taken me to state the proposition.

I request the Secretary to show me the Senate Journals for 1833, '34; to tell me what the journals are, and how they are kept or disposed of?

The Secretary stood up, and said: There is a manuscript copy of the journal, and a printed copy. The manuscript journal is but a single copy, and is the same that is read in the Senate every morning in sheets, and which is afterwards bound in a volume. From this manuscript 1010 copies are printed, and distributed as follows: [The Secretary here shewed the list of distribution, from which it appeared that 25 copies were to be placed in the library of Congress, 225 were to be furnished to the Governors, Legislatures, universities, colleges, and incorporated historical societies, in each state; two copies each to each member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; five copies each to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the heads of departments, Attorney General, Judges of the United States' courts; two each to all Federal officers; 25 to the Secretary of State; 35 copies for the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and two copies each to the Ministers from Great Britain, France, Spain, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, the Netherlands, Denmark, Portugal, the Hanseatic Republics, Mexico, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Buenos Ayres, Brazil, and Central America, and to the Consul of the two Sicilies.]

[To be continued]

THE MOON HOAX.

Every one remembers the famous moon hoax that was played upon the wise citizens of New York, and through them on those of the Union by a facetious and clever writer by the name of Richard Adams Locke. It appears that a copy has been presented to Sir John Herschel, whose discoveries in the moon the said paper purported to detail, by Capt. Caldwell of the American ship *Levant*, and the following is the letter of Sir John Herschel, acknowledging the receipt of the same.

To Capt. Caldwell, of the American ship *Levant*, Table Bay.
Veldhauser, near Wynberg.
CAPE OF GOOD HOPE, Jan. 2, 1836.
Sir John Herschel presents his compliments to Capt. Caldwell, and begs to thank him for the communication of the extraordinary and most elaborate hoax in the New York Journal of Commerce for Sept. 2, 1835, which he, Sir J. H. will be glad to be suffered to retain, partly as a curiosity, and partly as a perpetual reminder how trivial are the discoveries which all our boasted science has yet realized or is likely to reveal for ages to come, in comparison of what exists unknown and unsuspected among the realities of nature—even those nearest at hand and possibly not quite beyond our ultimate reach.

Sir J. H. will be happy (if Capt. Caldwell's stay at the Cape will permit) to satisfy him by ocular inspection, on how very humble a scale his astronomical operations here are conducted.

Burning of the Steamboat Randolph.—We learn from a Nashville paper, that this boat, while approaching the above mentioned town, March 16th, was discovered to be on fire, and on its being found impossible to extinguish the flames, was driven on shore. Owing to the presence of mind of the Captain, the crew and passengers were all saved, with the exception of three slaves, though the boat was burned to the water's edge.

Increase of the Army.—Gen. Macomb has submitted to the Senate, in obedience to a resolution, a plan for the increase of the army, from 6,000 to 10,000 men, without any increase of the number of officers. There is no difference of opinion, we believe, in regard to the propriety and indeed necessity of this increase.—*Fa. Obs.*

The French Treaty.—It appears by a recent Treasury statement, that the difference in the duties on French wines and silks stipulated for the Treaty of Indemnification has already amounted to six millions of dollars. The last instalment of the debt is not due yet.

Madame Marie Letitia Bonaparte died at Rome, at one o'clock on the morning of the 24th ult. She was born on the 24th of August, 1750, at Ajaccio, of the Bonaparte family, and had lived at Rome ever since 1814.