from *three States*, with an exemption rom taxation, (either by the payment of a *bonus* or otherwise) would, we should suppose, hold out inducements to capitalists, which must ensure the taking up of all the stock. Not only the original subscribers to the Louisville and Cincinnati Rail Road, but the stockholders in the Charleston and Hamburg Road, (all of whom by the terms of the contract for the purchase of the latter, became stockholders in the former road,) are entitled to subscribe to the bank, a privilege of which it is presumed they will not fail to avail themselves. Should the Company effect, under the guaranty of the State, the proposed loan of $2,000,000 in Europe of which there seems to be no doubt, and the bank shall be put in successful operation by the beginning of the ensuing year, all the serious difficulties in the way of the great enterprize will have been overcome. In the meantime, the extensive repairs and improvements now going on upon the Charleston and Hamburg Road, will have been completed, and from this source, large profits may be expected. In two years at farthest, the branch to Columbia will be finished, and must greatly increase these profits.

EXPLORING EXPEDITION.—J. N. Reynolds.—The Cincinnati and other Ohio papers, evince much spirit on the slight intimation which appears to have reached there, that Mr. Reynolds is not to accompany the expedition. We admire this noble feeling of State pride, as evinced by its press in behalf of her son, who has by a spirit of hardy, unconquerable enterprise, acquired already an enduring reputation for himself, and reflected credit upon his native state as well as upon the whole country. The public will be slow to credit that President Van Buren will permit his Secretaries to perform an act of such wanton injustice, as to exclude from all participation the author, the projector, the indefatigable, talented and successful advocate of the enterprise. At one time, says the Gazette, every measure was of high views and sound conception—a noble ship, a strong band of embodied science—a commander equal to the station in years, in maratime experience and intelligence. Suddenly all this promise was dissipated, and every thing was to commence as it were *de novo*—new ships, men, officers, new organizations—the razee was to come over them all.—Against this arrangement of Secretary Dickerson, a strong remonstrance, says the Gazette, has been presented to the President, subscribed we are told, by almost every western member of Congress. We are yet to see what effect it will produce; the country looks anxiously for something to be done, and will not be satisfied if Mr. Reynolds is neglected.

The Republican, an administration paper, transfers to its columns the article from the Gazette, and says the tribute therein contained is due to Mr. Reynolds, who is the projector of the expedition, and is a fair representation of the West upon this subject.

Mr. Reynolds may well afford to look on, and with composure abide the result—his triumph is complete. The Secretary of the Navy, with all his abettors has not been able to defeat the expedition. In his unworthy efforts to accomplish that object, he has been met boldly by Mr. Reynolds and written down. The expedition must go, the country has willed it, and Congress by three enactments has responded to that will, that is the first expedition from this country, it will not be the last.—*N. Y. Star.*

EX-PRESIDENT ADAMS.

Few men in this, or any other country, possess the same noble traits of character which distinguish this extraordinary man. Blest with sound health, a sound constitution, a vigorous, capacious, and highly cultivated mind, stored with an immense amount of knowledge, which has been acquired by experience, and unexampled industry, during nearly three fourths of a century—still he makes no display in equipage, or attire, but moves from place to place, with as much simplicity and unostentation as the plainest cultivator of the soil. From youth to the present period, his whole life has been devoted to the service of his country. Although elevated to the highest post of honor known to the Constitution, with his great intellect, and vast acquirements, yet this man readily attends to the smallest matters, with the utmost precision, regardless of his own comfort or convenience.

A few days ago, a gentleman from the South travelling to the Eastward, on entering the cars at the lower depot in Baltimore, missed his pocket book, containing money and valuable papers.—Subsequently the pocket-book was found the facts were stated to President Adams, who happened to be in the following train of cars (which left three hours later) who kindly offered to take possession of the package, and endeavor to find the owner.

Punctual to his engagement, on his arrival in Philadelphia, without a moment's loss of time, he left the cars, and under the rays of a burning and withering sun, with the thermometer at 95, he sought and found the owner, and delivered the package, before seeking lodgings for himself. Such acts of pure benevolence and kindness, are rare indeed: but they are characteristic of one of the greatest among living men.—[Patriot.

Sweets of life.—To straddle a hogshead and suck molosses through a straw.

Mr. Bond's speech is full of slang. The people will set their seal upon him at the next election.—*Ohio Eagle.*

And will a 'Bond' be any the less operative for bearing the broad 'Seal' of the people?—*Louisville Journal.*

For the Easton Gazette.

Mr. Graham:—

Permit me through you to tender my hearty acknowledgments to 4 C's for his prompt attention to my request, and to assure him, that I shall endeavor not to fall behind him in the notice I shall bestow upon the interrogatories which he has addressed to me. Nor will there, I trust, be any violation of that courtesy which, it seems, has induced his reply. I should feel both myself individually, and the Protestant community at large whose cause *I* defend, no little degraded. were I to use any other language than that which one Christian might, without offence, address to another. The interests of religious truth are rarely promoted by the angry, vituperative polemic; because the contrast between the weapons he employs, and the end at which he professes to aim, is visible to every beholder, and creates in the mind a feeling of aversion to his conduct, rather than a conviction of the soundness of his principles.

Your correspondent 4 C's wishes it to be understood, that should a pressure of circumstances compel him to withdraw from the contest, "his retreat may not be considered as implying an acknowledgment of discomfiture." On this point I have nothing to say for the public.—They must and will of course, think for themselves. For myself I would observe that it would ill become me, whatever opinion might be entertained of my success, to raise the shout of triumph; feeling as I do, that all the advantage which could be gained in such a contest, would necessarily result from the cause itself, and not from my efforts to sustain it.—The cause of Protestanism, it appears to me, is founded upon a rock, and cannot be overthrown. But as 4 C's has claimed the privilege of a retreat whenever he may be so disposed, I must, on my part, by way of an equivalent, insist upon the right of remaining on the arena as long as, in my own judgment, shall be expedient. I have, it is true, no great fondness for intellectual gladiatorship, especially amidst the bustle and turmoils of other urgent concerns, and when the thermonter measures more than ninety degrees of heat; but the calls of duty must be obeyed. Nothing but a sense of duty could, under such circumstances, have prevailed upon me either to give, or accept the challenge now pending between us.

It will be perceived by your readers that 4 C's, in the information which he has laid before them on the first point proposed by me, has asserted in very distinct and positive terms, the identity of the Roman Church, "in doctrine and dogmas of faith," with the Primitive Church—"that she is the Primitive Church herself." It is not necessary to examine here the definition which 4 C's has given us of a Church. That definition has no direct bearing on the question between us. All Christians admit that the Primitive Church was a true Church—that she was the Church established by our Saviour and his Apostles. The point to be decided is this: Is the assertion of 4 C's sustained by facts. If it is the Roman Church, "in doctrine & dogmas of faith;" is doubtless identical with the Primitive Church—she is, so far at least as doctrines are concerned, the Primitive Church herself: But if it is not, if the stern, unbending facts of history show that many of her doctrines are not Primitive and apostical, that she has undergone great and startling changes, and is now, in matters of vital importance, very far removed from the "faith once delivered to the saints," then the claim which she so constantly and so confidently sets up to immutability, will be seen in all its intrinsic weakness, and she will be discovered to have lost the simple and beautiful impress of antiquity which she seems to prize so highly.

I ask then, and I ask it with no little surprize, who could have imagined, after attentively viewing the position assumed by 4 C's, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is to be found in the creed of his Church—and not only found there, but the belief of it made essential to salvation! This doctrine maintains, "That in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation"* To say nothing of the utter inconsistency of so strange a dogma with the evidence of the senses, which it pointedly and somewhat unceremoniously contradicts, and of its terdency, in consequence, to overthrow from its foundation the whole fabric of our faith, in vain will it be searched for in the records of ecclesiastical antiquity. The Scriptures, the most ancient, and most venerable of those records, and the great fountain of all religious knowledge, cannot, by any legitimate process of interpretration, be made to yield it their support. If, for that purpose, they are brought down from the elevated and dignified position which they occupy as the revealed and unchangeable will of God, they immediately speak, not the language of inspiration, or even of plain, common sense, but of confusion and contradiction. When the Saviour said "Take, eat, this is my body" it is wholly inconceivable that he should have meant, or that his disciples should have understood him to mean, by the bread which he held in his hands, "truly, really, and substantially" his own body, which was reclining at the table. The idea would have been too strangely and too strikingly ludicrous for endurance and would, it is likely, have converted the solemn Eucharistic ceremony into a scene of merriment and ridicule. But on the supposition that he spoke of the bread and wine as the *symbols* of his body and blood, there was nothing strange or revolting in the language he used.

Why, too, is not the doctrine of transubstantiation embodied in the creeds of the ancient Church? The design of those creeds was, doubtless, to exhibit briefly, yet distinctly, and with a view to the convenience and capacity of members of the Church generally, all the essential truths of Christianity. To such an object they are singularly well adapted.—How comes it to pass then, that one of the most important doctrines of religion in the opinion of the Roman Church, one of the most necessary to the salvation of the soul, should have been entirely omitted by their compilers? This is truly a remarkable fact. Not a syllable, not even the most distant hint respecting it do they contain. They are profoundly, but very intelligibly silent on the subject; thus proving, beyond the power of contradiction, that no such doctrine existed at the period of their composition.

Nor can transubstantiation find any other writings of ecclesiastical antiquity more tractable and complaisant than the Scriptures, and creeds of the Primitive Church. The early fathers, it is certain, speak in a deeply reverential tone of the sacramental elements; but they always represent them as the symbols of the Saviour's body and blood, not as his body & blood "truly, really, and substantially." They call the bread the "figure of his body," and the wine the "mystic symbol of his blood," and the sacrament "spiritual food." They say that under the sign or "type of bread his body is given for us," and that under the "type of wine his blood is given for us;" that the Eucharist is to be "spiritually understood;" and that after the consecration of the elements in the Holy Supper, "the substance or nature of bread and wine does not cease to exist"* Expressions of this nature show, as clearly as language can show, the meaning they would convey when they speak of eating the Saviour's flesh and drinking his blood; that is, it is done invisibly, spiritually, and by faith in him as the Saviour of the world.

It is, however, quite unnecessary to multiply references on a subject which can be otherwise elucidated with great, and one would imagine, irresistible clearness. I allude now to the history of the dogma under consideration. And on this point it may be first of all remarked, that its parentage is not altogether so respectable as its advocates would have us believe. It is, in truth, the child of heresy. As 4 C's seems to be well versed in ecclesiastical history, he will here, doubtless, call to mind the disputes which arose about the middle of the fifth century, in the eastern section of the church, respecting the two natures of Christ—disputes which not only awakened the zeal, and enlisted the efforts of her individual members, but required the thunders of Councils to check their progress. They owed their origin to Eutyches,† abbot of a convent at Constantinople, who, in the violence of the war he waged against Nestorianism, the prevailing heresy of the times, ran into an opposite extreme, affirming that there was but one nature in Christ, viz: that of the incarnate word. He contended that the Saviour's material body had been wholly absorbed by his divinity; and in attempting to illustrate his position he had recourse to the Eucharist, asserting that as the bread and wine are converted substantially into the body and blood of Christ, so Christ's material nature had been altogether changed into the divine substance. His antagonists, among whom were Theodoret of Cyrus and Gelasius bishop of Rome, contested not only his original position, but also of his illustration. The substance of bread and wine, they argued, undergoes no change in the sacrament—that they are only symbollically the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually, not substantially eaten by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

The Eutychian controversy broke out in the year 448. That same year a council was convened by Flavianus archbishop of Constantinople, and as Eutyches refused to renounce his novel & obnoxious opinions, he was excommunicated and deposed. But this did not settle the matter. In 449 the Emperor Theodosius assembled another Council at Ephesius, in which Dioscovus bishop of Alexandria presided, by whose efforts and influence Eutyches was restored to the privileges of which he had been deprived, his doctrine declared to be Catholic and true, and Flavianus, president of the former council publicly beaten with rods, and so severely, that he died shortly after. This council received the significant, and very appropriate title of *Conventicus Latronum.* It was not to be expected that peace could be restored to the Church by such proceedings as these. Two years after Eutyches and his innovations were again condemned by the council of Chalcedon, and the doctrine of the two natures of Christ was finally settled as it is now understood both by Protestants and members of the Church of Rome.—Other troubles, which it is not necessary to mention, arose out of the same controversy. But it is worthy of remark, that Eutychianism properly so called, began to decline as soon as the opposition made to it became less violent, and finally sunk into profound forgetfulness, and expired, leaving however to the world, perhaps by way of revenge, its companion in tribulation,—the doctrine of the corporeal presence—which was afterwards to set the Church in a flame. The first notice which ecclesiastical councils seem to have taken of this dogma, except in conjunction with the heresy that gave it birth, occurred in the year 754, when a council was convened at Constantinople for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of using *images* in the worship of God. By it the Eucharist was decreed to be the true and only *image* of the life-giving body of Christ.' This decree condemned, if not directly, yet most strongly, the doctrine of the corporeal presence: For although it was aimed at the worship of images, the chief business which had called the council together, yet as it pronounced the Sacrament to be the image of Christ's body, we cannot imagine, that its framers, or the council which gave it their sanction, believed that the image of the Saviour's body, and his body itself were one and the same thing. Unfortunately for the credit of councils, however, and for the welfare of the Church, this salutary decree, and all the proceedings at Constantinople relative to the use and worship of images, and the Eucharist, were annulled thirty three years subsequently by the second council of Nice. Not only the use of images was there declared to be lawful; but the bread and wine in the Holy Sacrament were pronounced to be really and substantially the body and blood of Christ. But still Transubstantiation was not universally received. It was opposed at different periods, and by different writers, until eventually, in the pontificate of Innocent III. it was declared by the fourth Laterian council, held in 1215, to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and under the name* which it now bears, it was imposed upon all Christians.

Such are, briefly, the rise, progress, and ultimate triumph of Transubstantiation. It grew out of a heretical movement in the Church more than four hundred years after our Saviour. Writers of the same age, one of whom was bishop of that very Church, which at present seems to cherish it as the apple of her eye, opposed it. It continued to be the nursling of heresy, until, finding a more powerful patroness in the new kind of worship which was about to be introduced into the Christian religion, it formed an alliance with it, and, after numerous struggles, and various reverses of fortune, they both hand in hand, rode victoriously into the very heart of Rome, and are now firmly seated on the throne of St. Peter.

The reader is left to draw his own conclusion. I have only to remark further, Mr. Graham, that you shall continue to hear from me as circumstances may permit, until I shall have travelled over the entire ground marked out for me by 4 C's. The journey before me is long, it is true, but it will, I trust, be neither unpleasant nor profitless.

Yours respectfully

JUSTIN.

*Christian's Guide to Heaven." Published in 1826 in Philadelphia, with the approbation of the most reverend archbishop of Baltimore

*Tertullian, who flourished in the third century, says, "Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo; id est figura corporis mei. The bread received and distributed to his disciples, he made his body by saying this is my body; that is, the figure of my body Tertul. contr narci. Lib IV. cap. 40. See also Lib. I. cap 14 & Lib. III. cap 19. and cyprianus ad cæcilium de sacramento calicis dominici. He who could rise up from the perusal of this tract with the impression on his mind that Cyprian believed in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, would find it difficult, in any other way, to afford more convincing evidence of the influence which prejudice has over the mind.

†Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. pp. 72. 76.

Cave's Hist. Lit. p. 427.

*Mosheim thinks, that the term Transubstantiation was invented by Innocent III. Eccl. His. vol. III p 236. Cave. Hist. Lit p. 589, ascribes it to Peter of Blois, who flourished in 1160.

ASTOUNDING TRANSACTION.

The federal Vanites assert that their Sub-Treasury system, is now, and has been in partial operation since May 1837. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, (Mr. Cambreleng,) when he brought forward his Sub-Treasury bill in the House, thus exultingly expressed himself: 'Suppose we reject this bill and go home, does the Sub-Treasury cease? No, sir, it must continue now, the law of the land, and will continue through 1838, '39, '40, and '41, in spite of all the lamentations here or elsewhere.' This was the arrogant language employed towards the Representatives of the American people, by one speaking for the Executive and Treasury Department!

But, to a Sub-Treasury transaction, and let every freeman and patriot ponder it well.

Major Brant of the Quartermaster's Department, who was recently promoted to a Lieutenant Coloneley, and connected by marriage with Colonel Benton of the Senate, we learn from Philadelphia, was recently in that city, (we presume on his way home to St. Louis,) with a Treasury warrant for thirty thousand dollars on the Mint, at that place, payable in American gold! What means this incurring of expense and risk of transporting gold to Missouri? Is there no specie in the land offices of the Western States? We venture to express the belief that there is an abundance of it, even at the Land Offices in Missouri, and probably in the Bank of Missouri at St. Louis, at the credit of the Government. We have heard, within a few weeks past, that the Treasury Department had given six months credit on its *specie* drafts, drawn on some of the Ohio Land Offices, to be paid here in *specie*, at the end of that term. Behold it now sending gold from Philadelphia to the West! Why, and for what purpose has it been sent: We have been told through the columns of the Globe some scores of times, that Treasury notes in the West were worth more than specie, for the purposes of remittance. Why were they not sent, if funds are wanted in the West: and thereby obtain for the Government the premium they would command; & also, save to it the expense and risk of transporting gold? We all know, that the Quartermaster's drafts on the Department, payable in Philadelphia or New York, would command a premium of one per cent in St. Louis payable in specie. Then, we inquire again, why was the gold sent, at an expense and risk to the public? Was it that a certain prophecy may be fulfilled made two or three years since, that the time would speedily arrive, when gold would flow up the river Mississippi, and glisten through the interstices of the long silken purses of the farmers who inhabit the great valley that bears its name? Or was it for the purpose of proving to the people of Missouri, when their election takes place next month, that the long promised Golden Era has at length, and on that particular occasion, arrived to bless their State and secure unalloyed happiness to its citizens?

If such deeds take root in the sere, what will not follow in the green leaf of sub-Treasury existence!

The sub-Treasury plan is in partial operation—this transaction is one of the fruits of it! It is carrying out the doctrine of the address of the loco-foco committee, published in the Globe of the 17th inst., that 'the government only desires to manage its own business in its own way.' Let the scheme be put in full and complete operation by the passage of the bill, so as, in the language of the President, to 'give to the Government, that entire control over its own funds which I desire,' and we have an example in this single transaction of what would follow. We do not doubt, that a scene of profligacy and prostitution in the use of the public money, for the advancement of the corrupt purposes and views of ambitious aspirants, would succeed, without a parallel in the annals of history.

Let the people forewarn and forearm themselves by this example.—Madisonian.

From the Whig.

The Extravagance at Washington.

Some idea of the manner in which the sum of SIX MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, came to be missing from the treasury of the United States, may be gathered from the following extract from Mr. Garland's speech upon the sub-treasury:

'The collectors of the customs are 111, and receivers of public lands 66, and these classes alone, are in the default, according to the report of the Secretary of the treasures of the 17th of January last, as follows:

Receivers on sales of public lands,	$1,051,441 63
Collectors of Customs,	1,437,579 09
Making,	$2,489,020 72
To this amount may be added per recent defalcations not embraced in that report at least	150,000 00
	$2,6390,20 72
From this deduct for supposed errors,	500,006 00
	$2 139,020 72

Thus while there is due from defaulting banks which will likely be lost $759 729 45, there is due from collectors of the customs, & receivers from sales of the public lands $2,139,020 72. But this is not all. By referring to the executive documents of 1836-7, Nos, 24, 27, 37 and 44, there will be found a list of ballances due from disbursing agents of the army, and navy, and others of about $3,000,000, and in the post office department at least $200,000.'

The people's money is squandered by the *loco focos* with a fearful hand. Is it any wonder that Amos Kendall is the richest man in the country?

Reform.

Mr. Biddle is a most obliging man—He seldom refuses a proper request when asked of him. We have only in our mind now one that he did refuse, and that was made a Whig of Virginia, who, foreseeing what a fatal thing it would be to the Loco Focos, if he were dead, politely requested him to do him the favor to die! Mr. Biddle replied—thanked him for his consideration, and did full justice to his motives, but politely declined granting the favor. It was said by his opponents that it was the first favor he had ever refused his friends. We know nothing of that, but we have lately seen a case, in which opposite favors were asked by his friends and opponents, and he granted the latter! It is a suspicious story, but though true, is not conclusive evidence that he is going to turn Loco Foco. The facts were these.

The good citizens of the borough of Reading, Pennsylvania, were anxious that the shin plasters issued by their corporation should be redeemed and their circulation altogether stopped. For this purpose they applied for a loan from the Bank of the United States, and were about to get it, when in comes a petition from the Loco Foco Committee of safety praying that it might not be granted, as the loan could be for no other purpose than to sell the borough to the Bank? The petition was respectfully received and as carefully considered. A few days after Mr. Biddle returned the following answer to the Committee of the Town Council. Since then the Loco Focos boast of their influence with the monster!—[Balt. Chron.

Bank of the United States,
June 22, 1838.

Gentlemen:—I have had the honor of receiving your letter of the 31st. ultimo, requesting from this bank a Loan for three years of TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS, in Silver, for the purpose of redeeming the notes issued by the Borough of Reading, for sums less than one dollar. The Board of Directors approve entirely of the object of the Loan and were disposposed to grant it with great pleasure, when they received a published remonstrance against it by the 'Committee of Safety of the Borough of Reading,' who declare that 'it has been ascertained that the loan could have been intended for no other purpose than to sell the town to the said Bank and to put our citizens and their posterity into the power of the Philadelphia Money King.' I am sure that the worthy members of the Committee of Safety will on reflection perceive that they have been misled by their zeal in ascribing to the town council a desire to sell their constituents, or to the Bank the least desire to make such an acquisition; and I am quite sure that the respectable inhabitants of Reading are wholly incapable of being influenced by the sordid motives ascribed to them. Nevertheless, as there seems to be so much opposition to the measure, and as its adoption may give alarm to a portion of your community, it is deemed most proper to decline the proposed loan.

Very respectfully yours,
NICHOLAS BIDDLE, Pres't.

RECAPTURE.

The American schr. Lone, captain Clark, which appears to have been intercepted by the French blockading squadron off Matamoras, and placed under charge of a crew from one of the French armed vessels, has returned to New Orleans. The particulars of her recapture are contained in the missing New Orleans slips of the 11th. The True American of the 12th thus refers to the event:

Few things have occurred here to cause so much undisguised mirth as the exploit of Capt. Clark, of the schooner, Lone, his mate and steward, in retaking the vessel, and bringing the prize crew of nine Frenchmen safely into port, bound hand and foot. The particulars of this matter were so generally published yesterday that it is useless to repeat them here. It was highly amusing to observe the worthy Captain reporting himself and his story to the Collector of this port. While the officials were bursting with suppressed mirth, Captain Clark proceeded with his story as solemn as a judge in the criminal court. He seemed far more troubled with the few words of the Collector than in surrounding with his body guard of two the whole of the nine French sailors; and when some doubts were expressed whether the schooner must be sent back again, he calmly observed, he couldn't see why,—it was the duty of every captain to bring his vessel to her port of destination. We learn that it was deemed necessary to make a special deposit of the specie to the order of the government, and to take bonds for the vessel, and cargo, pending the transmission of instructions from head quarters. The Captain and his company have immortalized themselves, and many was the joke cracked, and bottle too, while laughing at the dilemma of the sleeping lieutenant and his tied up crew. [From the N. Orleans Picayune July 12.]

Among the passengers on the steamboat Columbia from Galveston, last night was Mr. John Bellow, Jr. of this city, (the son of the principal owner of the Lone) and another gentlemen, who were passengers on that schooner at the time of her capture by the French blockading squadron. They were brought to Galveston by the U. S. sloop of war Vandalia, which received them at Brazos Santiago. Mr. B. carried under his arm the *heaviest pea jacket* we ever lifted. It was worth at least $1800 in specie. He fancied it was the only vestige that remained of the Lone until we informed him of her safe arrival in port. His agreeable surprise on hearing of Captain Clark's trick may well be imagined.

FROM THE SOUTH.

Herald Office,
NORFOLK, July 22, 3 P. M.

We learn from Capt. Mitchell of the steamboat Columbia that President Van Buren may be expected here to-morrow, on a visit of observation to the different public establishments in our vicinity—and we presume, of course, to abide for a season at the Rip Raps (as was the wont of his 'illustrious predecesser,') where he will experience an agreeable relief from the cares and fatigues of his official duties. The President will leave Washington to-day in the Columbia.

From Charleston.—By the steam packet South Carolina, Captain Coffey, we have the Charleston papers to Friday. The South Carolina brought nearly 200 passengers, among whom were Capt. Dulany; Lieut. Young, Lieut. Watson, Dr. Brown, and 135 non-commissioned officers and privates, of the U. S. Marine Corps, being the remainder of the several detachments taken from the Atlantic stations two years ago, and since then have actively been employed in the wars with the Creeks and the Seminoles, and latterly in effecting the removal of the Cherokees. On their arrival here they were immediately transferred to the steamer Columbia, and proceeded on to Washington without an hour's detention. Poor fellows! they have seen hard service as their forlorn appearance testifies

The London Chronicle of the 3d of April gives an extract from the account of the catastrophe of Skaptar Yokul, as given by Captain S. R. Bently, of the schr. Falerio, in which he says that about three o'clock the wind shifted and blowing nearly astern, we made sixteen knots per hour. At two o'clock we had left the current, and at sunrise took our attitudes for discovering our location. What was our surprise on finding out latitude 67 north by long. 29 deg. and 42 m. W., the precise longitude and latitude of Iceland. The awful idea then flashed upon us that the whole Island had sunk. A few more observations convinced us of the truth of our apprehensions. The whole Island, nearly equal to England in size, with upwards of 50,000 inhabitants, on that same awful night, in which our vessel lay before it, and the last prayer of so many distracted wretches, were hushed in the scalding waves that closed over that ill-fated Island. Thus is a nation buried in a single night, and the mariner has a highway over his grave.

'Massa, one ob your oxens is dead—todder too. I was afraid to tell of em bot at one, 'traid you couldn't bore it.'

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11031-0406.jpg