BY AUTHORITY.

LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES PASSED AT THE FIRT SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

[PUBLIC, No. 5.]

AN ACT to authorize the issuing of a Register to the brig American, of Savannah.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be issued, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, a register to the brig American, a French vessel, which vessel was stranded on the coast of the United States, and purchased by James Taylor, of Savannah, Georgia, and by him repaired: *Provided*, it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the cost of the repairs made in the United States, after the purchase of the said vessel, by the present owner, exceeds three-fourths of the original cost of building a vessel of the same tonnage in the United States.

ANDREW STEVENSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
M. VAN BUREN,
Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

Approved, May 1st, 1834.
ANDREW JACKSON.

MESSAGE

Of the President of the United States.

Sent to the Senate March 11, 1834.

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1834.

To the Senate:

I renominate Henry D. Gilpin, Peter Wager and John T. Sullivan, of Philadelphia, and Hugh McElderry, of Baltimore, to be Directors in the Bank of the United States for the year 1834.

I disclaim all pretension of right, on the part of the President, officially to inquire into, or call in question, the reasons of the Senate for rejecting any nomination whatsoever. As the President is not responsible to them for the reasons which induce him to make a nomination, so they are not responsible to him for the reasons which induce them to reject it. In these respects, each is independent of the other, and both responsible to their respective constituents. Nevertheless, the attitude in which certain vital interests of the country are placed by the rejection of the gentlemen now renominated, require of me frankly to communicate my views of the consequences which must necessarily follow this act of the Senate, if it be not reconsidered.

The character and standing of these gentlemen are well known to the community, and eminently qualify them for the office to which I propose to appoint them. Their confirmation, by the Senate, at its last session, to the same offices, is proof that such was the opinion of them entertained by the Senate at that time; and unless something has occurred since to change it, this act may now be referred to as evidence that their talents and pursuits justified their selection.

The refusal, however, to confirm their nominations to the same offices, shows that there is something in the conduct of these gentlemen, during the last year, which, in the opinion of the Senate, disqualifies them; and as no charge has been made against them, as men or citizens, nothing which impeaches the fair private character they possessed when the Senate gave them their sanction at its last session; and as it moreover appears from the Journal of the Senate, recently transmitted for my inspection, that it was deemed unnecessary to inquire into their qualifications or character, it is to be inferred that the change in the opinion of the Senate, has arisen from the official conduct of these gentlemen. The only circumstances in their official conduct which have been deemed of sufficient importance to attract public attention, are the two reports made by them to the Executive Department of the government, the one bearing date the 22d day of April, and the other the 19th day of August last; both of which reports were communicated to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury, with his reasons for removing the deposites.

The truth of the facts stated in these reports, is not, I presume, questioned by any one. The high character and standing of the citizens by whom they were made, prevent any doubt upon the subject. Indeed, the statements have not been denied by the President of the Bank and the other Directors. On the contrary, they have insisted that they were authorized to use the money of the Bank in the manner stated in the two reports, and have not denied that the charges there made against the corporation are substantially true. It must be taken, therefore, as admitted, that the statements of the Public Directors, in the reports above mentioned, are correct; and they disclose the most alarming abuses on the part of the corporation, and the most strenuous exertions, on their part, to put an end to them. They prove that enormous sums were secretly lavished in a manner, and for the purposes that cannot be justified; and that the whole of the immense capital of the Bank has been virtually placed at the disposal of a single individual, to be used, if he thinks proper, to corrupt the Press, and to control the proceedings of the government, by exercising an undue influence over elections.

The reports were made in obedience to my official directions; and I herewith transmit copies of my letters, calling for information of the proceedings of the Bank. Were they bound to disregard the call? Was it their duty to remain silent, while abuses of the most injurious and dangerous character were daily practised? Were they bound to conceal from the constituted authorities a course of measures destructive to the best interests of the country, and intended gradually and secretly to subvert the foundations of our government, and to transfer its powers from the hands of the People, to a great moneyed corporation? Was it their duty to sit in silence at the Board, and witness all these abuses, without an attempt to correct them, or, in case of failure there, not to appeal to higher authority? The eighth fundamental rule authorizes any one of the Directors, whether elected or appointed, who may have been absent when an excess of debt was created, or who may have dissented from the act, to exonerate himself from personal responsibility, by giving notice of the fact to the President of the United States; thus recognising the propriety of communicating to that officer the proceedings of the Board in such cases. But independently of any argument to be derived from the principle recognised in the rule referred to, I cannot doubt for a moment that it is the right and the duty of every Director at the Board to attempt to correct all illegal proceedings, and in case of failure, to disclose them; and that every one of them, whether elected by the stockholders, or appointed by the government, who had knowledge of the facts and concealed them, would be justly amenable to the severest censure.

But in the case of the public Directors, it was their peculiar and official duty to make the disclosures; and the call upon them for information could not have been disregarded, without a flagrant breach of their trust. The Directors appointed by the U. States cannot be regarded in the light of the ordinary Directors of a Bank appointed by the stockholders, and charged with the care of their pecuniary interests in the corporation. They have higher and more important duties. They are public officers. They are placed at the Board, not merely to represent the stock held by the U. States, but to observe the conduct of the corporation, and to watch over the public interests. It was foreseen that this great moneyed monopoly might be so managed as to endanger the interests of the country: and it was therefore deemed necessary, as a measure of precaution, to place at the Board watchful sentinels, who should observe its conduct, and stand ready to report to the proper officers of the government, every act of the Board which might affect injuriously the interests of the People.

The whole frame of the charter, as well as the manner of their appointment, proves this to be their true character. The United States are not represented at the Board by these Directors merely on account of the stock held by the government. The right of the U. States to appoint Directors, and the number appointed, do not depend upon the amount of the stock, for if every share should be sold, and the United States cease to be a stockholder altogether, yet under the charter the right to appoint five Directors would still remain. In such a case, what would be the character of the Directors? They would represent no stock, and be chosen by no stockholder. Yet they would have a right to sit at the Board, to vote on all questions submitted to it, and to be made acquainted with all the proceedings of the corporation. They would not in such a case be ordinary Directors, chosen by the stockholders in proportion to their stock—but they would be public officers, appointed to guard the public interest; and their duties must conform to their office. They are not the duties of an ordinary Director, chosen by a stockholder; but they are the peculiar duties of a public officer, who is bound on all occasions to protect to the utmost of his lawful means, the public interest, and where his own authority is not sufficient to prevent injury, to inform those to whom the law has confided the necessary power. Such then is the character, and such are the duties of the Directors appointed by the United States, whether the public be stockholders or not—They are officers of the U. States, and not the mere representatives of a stockholder.

The mode of their appointment and their tenure of office confirm this position. They are appointed like other officers of the government, and by the same authority. They do not hold their offices irrevocably a year after their appointment: on the contrary, by the express terms of the law, they are liable to be removed from office at any time by the President, when, in his judgment the public interest shall require it. In every respect, therefore, in which the subject can be considered, it is evident that the five Directors, appointed by the U. States, are to be regarded as public officers, who are placed there in order to observe the conduct of the corporation, and to prevent abuses which might otherwise be committed.

Such being the character of the Directors appointed on behalf of the United States, it is obviously their duty to resist, and, in case of failure, to report to the President, or to the Secretary of the Treasury, any proceedings of the Board by which the public interest may be injuriously affected. The President may order a scire facias against the Bank for a violation of its charter, and the Secretary of Treasury is empowered to direct the money of the United States to be deposited elsewhere, when, in his judgment, the public interest requires it to be done. The Directors of this Bank, like all others, are accustomed to sit with closed doors, and do not report their proceedings to any department of the government. The monthly return which the charter requires to be made to the Treasury Department, gives nothing more than a general statement of its pecuniary condition, and of that but an imperfect one. For although it shows the amount loaned at the Bank and its different branches, it does not show the condition of its debtors, nor the circumstances under which the loans were made. It does not show whether they were, in truth, accommodations granted in the regular and ordinary course of business, upon fair banking principles, or from other motives. Under the name of loans, advances may be made to persons notoriously insolvent, for the most corrupt and improper purposes, and a course of proceeding may be adopted, in violation of its charter, while upon the face of its monthly statement, every thing would appear to be fair and correct.

How, then, is the Executive branch of the Government to become acquainted with the official conduct of the public Directors, or the abuses practised by the Corporation for its private ends, and in violation of its duty to the public? The power of displacing the public Directors, and that of issuing a *scire facias* and of removing the deposites, were not intended to be idle and nugatory provisions, without the means of enforcement. Yet they must be wholly inoperative and useless, unless there be some means by which the official conduct of the public Directors, and the abuses of power on the part of the Corporation, may be brought to the knowledge of the Executive Department of the Government.

Will it be said that the power is given to the Secretary of the Treasury, to examine himself, or by his authorized agent, into the conduct and condition of the Bank? The answer is obvious. It could not have been expected or intended that he would make an examination, unless information was first given to him which excited his suspicion; and if he did make such general examination without previous information of misconduct, it is most probable, that in the complex concerns and accounts of the Bank, it would result in nothing, whatever abuses might have been practised.

It is indeed the duty of every Director to give information of such misconduct, on the part of the Board. But the power to issue a scire facias, and to remove the deposites, presupposes that the Directors elected by the stockholders, might abuse their power: and it cannot be presumed that Congress intended to rely on these same Directors to give information of their own misconduct. The Government is not accustomed to rely on the offending party to disclose his offence. It was intended that the power to issue a *scire facias* and remove the deposites, should be real and effective. The necessary means of information were, therefore, provided in the charter; and five officers of the Government, appointed in the usual manner, responsible to the public, and not to the stockholders, were placed as sentinels at the Board, and are bound by the nature and character of their office, to resist, and, if unsuccessful, to report to the proper authority, every infraction of the charter, and every abuse of power, in order that due measures should be taken to punish or correct it: and, in like manner, it is their duty to give, when called upon, any explanation of their own official conduct, touching the management of the institution.

It was, perhaps, scarcely necessary to present to the Senate these views of the powers of the Executive, and of the duties of the five Directors appointed by the United States. But the Bank is believed to be now striving to obtain for itself the government of the country; and is seeking, by new and strained constructions, to wrest from the hands of the constituted authorities, the salutary control reserved by the charter. And, as misrepresentation is one of its most usual weapons of attack, I have deemed it my duty to put before the Senate, in a manner not to be misunderstood, the principles on which I have acted.

Entertaining, as I do, a solemn conviction of the truth of these principles, I must adhere to them, and act upon them with constancy and firmness. Aware, as I now am, of the dangerous machinations of the Bank, it is more than ever my duty to be vigilant in guarding the rights of the People from the impending danger. And I should feel that I ought to forfeit the confidence with which my countrymen have honored me, if I did not require regular and full reports of every thing in the proceedings of the Bank, calculated to affect injuriously the public interests, from the public Directors. And if the Directors should fail to give the information called for, it would be my imperious duty to exercise the power conferred on me by the law, of removing them from office, and of appointing others, who would discharge their duties with more fidelity to the public. I can never suffer any one to hold office under me who would connive at corruption, or who should fail to give the alarm when he saw the enemies of liberty endeavoring to sap the foundations of our free institutions, and to subject the free People of the United States to the dominion of a great moneyed corporation.

Any Directors of the Bank, therefore, who might be appointed by the Government, would be required to report to the Executive as fully as the late Directors have done, and more frequently, because the danger is more imminent; and it would be my duty to require of them a full detail of every part of the proceedings of the corporation, or any of its officers, in order that I might be enabled to decide, whether I should exercise the power of ordering a scire facias, which is reserved to the President by the charter, or adopt such other lawful measures, as the interests of the country might require. It is too obvious to be doubted, that the misconduct of the corporation would never have been brought to light by the aid of a public proceeding at the Board of Directors. The Board, when called on by the Government Directors, refused to institute an inquiry or require an account; and the mode adopted by the latter was the only one by which the object could be attained. It would be absurd to admit the right of the Government Directors to give information, and at the same time deny the means of obtaining it. It would be but another mode of enabling the Bank to conceal its proceedings, and practise with impunity its corruptions. In the mode of obtaining the information, therefore, and in their efforts to put an end to the abuses disclosed, as well as in reporting them, the conduct of the late Directors was judicious and praiseworthy; and the honesty, firmness, and intelligence which they have displayed, entitle them, in my opinion, to the gratitude of the country.

But, if I do not mistake the principles on which the Senate have recently rejected them, the conduct which I deem worthy of praise, they treat as a breach of duty; and, in their judgment, the measures which they took to obtain the information, and their efforts to put an end to the practices disclosed, and the reports they have made to the Executive, although true in all their parts, are regarded as an offence, and supposed to require some decisive mark of strong disapprobation.

If the views of the Senate be such as I have supposed, the difficulty of sending to the Senate any other names than those of the late Directors, will be at once apparent. I cannot consent to place before the Senate the name of any one, who is not prepared with firmness and honesty, to discharge the duties of a public Director in the manner they were fulfilled by those whom the Senate have refused to confirm. If, for performing a duty lawfully required of them by the Executive, they are to be punished by the subsequent rejection of the Senate, it would not only be useless, but cruel, to place men of character and honor in that situation, if even such men could be found to accept it. If they failed to give the required information, or to take proper measures to obtain it, they would be removed by the Executive. If they gave the information, and took proper measures to obtain it, they would, upon the next nomination, be rejected by the Senate. It would be unjust in me to place any other citizens in the predicament in which this unlooked for decision of the Senate has placed the estimable and honorable men who were Directors during the last year.

If I am not in error in relation to the principles upon which these gentlemen have been rejected, the necessary consequence will be that the Bank will hereafter be without Government Directers, and the People of the United States must be deprived of their chief means of protection against its abuses—for whatever conflicting opinions may exist, as to the right of the Directors appointed in January, 1833, to hold over until new appointments shall be made, it is very obvious that whilst their rejection by the Senate remains in force, they cannot, with propriety, attempt to exercise such a power. In the present state of things, therefore, the corporation will be enabled effectually to accomplish the object it has so long been endeavoring to attain. Its exchange committees, and its delegated powers to its President, may hereafter be dispensed with, without incurring the danger of exposing its proceedings to the public view. The sentinels which the law had placed at its board can no longer appear there.

Justice to myself and to the faithful officers by whom the public has been so well and so honorably served, without compensation or reward, during the last year, has required of me this full and frank exposition of my motives for nominating them again after their rejection by the Senate. I repeat that I do not question the right of the Senate to confirm or reject at their pleasure: and if there had been any reason to suppose that the rejection in this case had not been produced by the causes to which I have attributed it, or if my views of their duties and the present importance of their rigid performance were other than they are, I should have cheerfully acquiesced, and attempted to find others who would accept the unenviable trust. But I cannot consent to appoint Directors of the Bank to be the subservient instruments or silent spectators of its abuses and corruptions; nor can I ask honorable men to undertake the thankless duty, with the certain prospect of being rebuked by the Senate for its faithful performance, in pursuance of the lawful directions of the Executive.

I repeat, that I do not claim a right to inquire into, or officially to censure, the acts of the Senate. But the situation in which the important interests of the American People, vested in the Bank of the United States, and affected by its arrangements, must necessarily be left by the rejection of the gentlemen now re-nominated, has made it my duty to give this explanation to the Senate, and submit the matter to their consideration. If it shall be determined by the Senate that all channels of information in relation to the corrupt proceedings of this dangerous corporation shall be cut off, and the Government and country left exposed to its unrestrained machinations against the purity of the press and public liberty, I shall, after having made this effort to avert so great an evil, rest for the justification of my offical course, with respectful confidence, on the judgment of the American People.

In conclusion, it is proper I should inform the Senate that there is now no Government Directors appointed for the present year; Mr. Bayard, who was nominated and confirmed by the Senate, having refused to accept that appointment.

ANDREW JACKSON.

From the New York Evening Star, May 3.

LATEST FROM EUROPE.

By the ship Victoria, Capt. Morrell, from Liverpool, we have been put in possession of papers of that place to the 5th, and from London to the 3d April.

It will be perceived that the political state of Europe remained the same. Rumors respecting Spain and Portugal were continually in circulation.

The woollen and worsted districts were daily becoming worse—a large number of workmen being out of employ—owing to the high price of wool, the supply of which was short, owing to the increase of the consumption of the article, which has been gradually growing.

The proceedings of parliament are uninteresting.

The subject of the Treaty with the United States, was under consideration in the French Chambers on the 31st March, but the debate upon it was not closed.

At Madrid an invasion of Portugal was spoken of, for the purpose of expelling Don Carlos. The official paper of Madrid speaks of the necessity of effecting this object, but declares no hostilities are intended against Miguel, but it is supposed they will never be allowed to enter Portugal only as the allies of the young Queen.

At Constantinople every thing had assumed a warlike appearance. The fleet was actively preparing; the garrison at the Dardanelles was to be strengthened, and no doubt remains that the Porte is determined to resist the intervention of other Powers to oblige him to renounce his engagements with Russia.

The French Ministers have succeeded in carrying their law on the subject of associations nearly in the state in which they first proposed it,—all the amedments at all calulated either to modify its oppressive character or even to limit its duration having been rejected by large majorities. At the final debate, which took place on the 25th ult. M. Page spoke strongly against the measure, and in the course of his speech made the following solemn protest against it:—

"If (said the Hon. Deputy) a Frenchman, an honorable man wishes to form a union to propogate, strengthen, or preserve Christianity—I am his man, in spite of your Ministers and your law.

"If a Frenchman, an honorable man wishes to form a union, to extend charity and assistance to the poor and laboring classes, to the sick, or to the workmen out of employ—I am his man, in spite of your Ministers and your law.

"If any Frenchman, an honorable man, wishes more extensively to diffuse acquired truth, sound doctrines, and the knowledge which prepares for the morality of the future and the happiness of mankind—I am his man, in spite of your Ministers and your law.

"If any Frenchman, an honorable man, wishes to secure to his country, the safeguard of electoral independence, and oppose disgraceful elections, which deliver political venality up to Ministerial corruption—I will be him, in spite of your Ministers and your law.

"The slave of all just laws, the enemy of all unjust laws, between the persecutors and their victims, I will not hesitate. I known no human power which can make me apostatize from God, humanity and France. I will disobey your laws to obey my conscience.

On the division, the numbers were for the bill, 246, against it 154—mayority 62. Several of the societies in the provinces have already protested against the law, & announce their determination to disobey it. Some of the most distinguished members of the *Society des droits de l' homme* have deemed it expedient to quit Paris. The veteran patriot, Lafayette, has delivered the following written protest against the measure.

"The new and progressive attack on our July revolution has been so completely manifest on both sides in the debate that my forced absence from the Chamber, is a subject of regret for myself alone. I could nevertheless, have certified to the heirs of 89 and 1830 that, even under the ancient regime, such an interdiction, subject to the good pleasure of the police of Sarines and Lenoir, would have excited astonishment and indignation, even in the Salons of Versailles. I now confine myself to adding my personal protest to the numerous votes of my honorable colleagues against this anti-social consequence of a system, the origin and tendency of which I pointed out long ago

"Paris, 26th March, 1834.

(Signed) "LAFAYETTE."

The *Tribune* has the following:—The *Union de Juillet* held a general meeting yesterday, under the presidency of General Lafayette, when they entered a protest against the Associations Bill, and pledged themselves not to submit to it! Without making public things which concern the society alone, we say that more than one deputy was present at the meeting, and that M. Laffitte was not the least energetic in recommending resistance."

London, March 30.—At a late hour yesterday afternoon an express reached the city yesterday from Falmouth, bringing information of the arrival there of his Majesty's brig the Savage, from Lisbon, whence she sailed on the 16th inst. the news by this vessel, if confirmed is unfavorable to the success of the cause of the young Queen. It is said that the Miguelites were showing a most determined front at Santarem, erected fortifications outside the town, and from their preparations, it was supposed were about to attack the young Queen's troops. Don Miguel had withdrawn a body of his troops from Oporto to strengthen his army near Santarem.

The Pedroites were using exertions to prevent supplies being sent to the Miguelites, and for this purpose the Belgians had been dispersed over the South. It was not supposed that Don Pedro would be enabled successfully to engage the Miguelites without further augmentation, as, from the state of the country, it was scarcely possible for him to concentrate his forces. By the Savage the commandant of the arsenal at Lisbon had arrived at Falmouth, on his way to Brest, where he was proceeding to obtain supplies.

Bayonne, March 22—It appears that the Carlists had received the promise of three days pillage at Vittoria but the very day of their entrance, they thought proper to abandon that town. The commander of the Queen's troops, Osma, pursued their rear guard, and made 27 prisoners, who have probably been shot, in retaliation for the execution of their prisoners made by insurgents. The Carlists had 380 horsemen, commanded by a chief who had fought in America." We have the following from St. Sebastian:—

200 militiamen were at Gamarra, near Vittoria; these unfortunate men, after a vigorous resistance, in which 40 were killed, surrendered, on the express condition that their lives should be spared; but they were instantly shot. The insurgents then penetrated by different streets into the town, where they met with so obstinate a resistance that they were obliged to retire leaving a great many dead, and 50 prisoners whose death was loudly called for. The greatest praise is due to Gen. Joaquim de Osma, who, without hat or sword, put himself at the head of the militia and the volunteers, and gave an example of the most brilliant valor in falling upon the Carlists. On the following day several cars were laden with the insurgents killed; the rebels required 150 horses to carry away their wounded. Thus but for the loss of the 200 militia, the attack on Vittoria would have been a glorious day."

Bayonne March 24.—"Simon Torre, an ex-officer of the Royal Guards, who joined the insurgents from the very commencement, and obtained the command of a battalion among them, has turned traitor. On the 17th inst. he led the little troop of which he was chief, composed of from 500 to 700 men, into an ambuscade, when those who escaped with life were made prisoners by Gen. Espartero, who was lying in wait to suprise them. He himself was conveyed in safety on board a French brig of war, lying at anchor in the harbor at Bilboa."

The American Trade.—The unparalleled embarrassments amongst the commercial classes of the United States, have produced a great stagnation in the trade between this country and that recently flourishing republic. The numerous failures which have occurred in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the other cities of the union, have been felt both directly and indirectly in England. Directly in their effect on individual firms, and indirectly in their effect on the general state of credit. There is, of course, a great indisposition on this side of the Atlantic to risk goods, or to enter into commercial transactions at present, in a country in which undoubted solvency and unblemished integrity are no securities against embarrassment and ruin, and the commercial classes on the other side find too much difficulty in meeting their engagements in the present disordered state of trade and suspension of credit, to have either disposition or ablity to extend their concerns.

Thus the prospects of a vast and profitable trade with the United States, which only a few months since seemed so bright, have been clouded, and it is impossible to tell when the cloud shall pass away. A rancorous spirit of party seems to have destroyed every thing like reasonableness in the government. Under these circumstances, the close and intimate connection between the American republic and the British Empire, compels us to endure a considerable share of the inconvenience resulting from the embarrassments of our transatlantic friends and customers. The exports of iron, woollen goods, cutlery, hosiery, and we have no doubt of all other articles, have received a severe check, from which they will not recover until the Americans and their government recover their senses. When that will be it is impossible to guess, for up to the latest accounts, the exasperation of all parties seem only to be increased by the increasing misery of every class of the people. Each party lays the blame on the other, and none does any thing to restore public or private confidence.

The Belgian papers which we have received, make mention of various movements of Belgian troops towards the frontier of North Brabant, and appear to flatter themselves by this means their country is secured against the invasion of which they dream in Belgium.

One of the journals says on this subject, "The fear which seems to have seized on the Belgian Deputies is wholly groundless, and their notions are too ridiculous to merit a serious refutation."

A letter from Antwerp, in a Ghent Journal says—"The house of William Wood Leaven and Son, of this city has sold to the clergy the extensive buildings in which they carry on their manufactures of muslin. It is intended to convert this building into a Convent for Nuns. Before the revolution, M. Wood gave employment to about 1,500 persons in Antwerp, and 5,000 in the whole kingdom. He is now going to settle at Amsterdam, where he already has a house under his own name. Blessed effects of our revolution!"

ONE DAY LATER FROM EUROPE.

IMPORTANT FROM FRANCE.

By the ship St. Lawrence, at New York from Liverpool, a London paper of the 4th April has been received. It furnishes the important intelligence that the Chamber of Deputies of France, on the 1st of April, rejected, by a majority of eight, the appropriation of 25,000,000 francs for indemnity for spoliations committed on American property, guarantied by the Treaty of July 4, 1831, in consequence of which two of the Ministers, the Duc de Broglie, and General Sebastiana, had resigned.

The Second Edition of the Daily Advertiser contains the following details:

FRANCE.

CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES—April 1.

The project of a law authorizing the appropriation of 25,000,000 f. for the payment of all claims of indemnity preferred by the government of the United States, was rejected by a vote of 176 to 168—majority against the bill 8.

In consequence of this decision, the Duke de Broglie and General Sebastiana resigned their places in the Ministry.

LONDON, April 4, 1834.—We have received, by express, the whole of the French papers of Wednesday, together with a letter from our regular Paris correspondent dated Wednesday afternoon. Their contents are important. The Duke de Broglie, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and General Sebastiana, Minister of State without a portefuille, have resigned.—Their resolution to that effect was taken on Tuesday evening, in consequence of the rejection by the Chamber of Deputies of the Ministerial project of law, for a grant of 25,000,000f. (1000,000*l.*) to be appropriated to the liquidation of all claims made on France by the government of the U. States, for losses sustained by the operation of the Berlin and Milan decrees, and the British Orders in Council with which those decrees were followed. A convention had been signed by which the French government had engaged to pay the 25,000,000f. Its non-fulfilment, in consequence of the vote of the Chamber, was deemed by Duke de Broglie, a decided obstacle to his continuance in office. No successor to the Duke de Broglie had yet been chosen, nor does it appear that up to Wednesday afternoon any steps had been taken with that view.

The news from Spain, brought by these readers, is also important.

LONDON, Thursday April 3.

EXPRESS FROM PARIS.

PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

PARIS, Wednesday, 2 o'clock, P. M.

The following paragraph appears in the Moniteur of this morning:—

"This evening, after the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies, the Duke de Broglie and General Sebastiana delivered their resignations into the hands of the King."

By referring to the report of yesterday's proceedings in the Chamber of Deputies, you will find that the project of law authorizing the appropriation of 25,000,000 f. (£1,000,000,) for the payment to all claims to indemnity preferred by the government of the United States on France, was rejected by a majority of 176 against 168, making an absolute majority of 8 against the project.

Great exertions had been made by ministers to induce the Chamber to vote for the project, and on no previous occasion perhaps did the Duke de Broglie use his powers of oratory to so great an extent as this. But those who had made up their minds that a grant of 12,000,000f would have been a very ample compensation of the real amount of loss sustained, being told that they must vote for the 25,000,000f. proposed by the project, or against the project altogether, inasmuch as a convention with the United States, stipulating for that sum had been signed, and must either be fully executed or wholly rejected, preferred the rejection, with all the consequences it threatened, to the chance of a vote by which they were required to provide for what appeared to them an unnecessary surplus.

In the evening a Cabinet Council was held at the Tuilleries, to consult on the steps that were to be taken. It was attended by all the Ministers, except the two who had given in their resignations. The substance of what has transpired is, that it was determined that every means should be used to induce the Duke de Broglie to recall his act of resignation before the choice of the successor should be thought of. I am assured, however, that up the present moment the Duke has not consented to remain in office. If he persists until tomorrow, his successor will be chosen without loss of time. Who the new Minister of Foreign Affairs may be it is yet impossible to form a conjecture, as the occurrence which will probably call for his appointment was quite unexpected, and no preparation had therefore been thought of to meet the consequences of it. Some persons speak of Count de St. Aulaire, now Ambassador at Vienna. He is father-in-law to the Duke De Cazes, and already it is believed by the same persons that an early consequence of such a nomination will be the appointment of the latter to the London Embassy; which he held as a sort of honourable exile, when the Ultra-Royalists in 1820 obtained his removal from the Councils of Louis XVIII., over which he had for some time exercised, as all the world knows, a very considerable influence.

The Duke de Broglie's resignation may lead to that of his friend, M. Guizot, Minister of Public Instruction, but it will probably not affect any of the other members of the Cabinet. As to M. Sebastiana, whether he had chosen to resign or to retain his title of Minister of State without attributions, it was a matter of no consequence whatever to any body. People only are surprised, that being yet possessed of sufficient powers of reflection to have deemed his retirement necessary after the formal disapproval pronounced by the Chamber of a treaty to which he was a party, he had not long before felt the superfluity of his presence in the Cabinet.

Letters of the 27th of March have been received to-day from Madrid. It would appear from them that the projected expedition to Portugal has been resolved upon by the Spanish Government, and that the troops were already despatched to the frontier. Some persons suppose that the expedition is not undertaken with the only view of driving Don Carlos from the frontier of Spain, but also to afford assistance to Don Pedro against Don Miguel. This supposition, however, rests merely on the fact that M. Sarmento, the Envoy of Donna Maria, had had an audience of the Regent of Spain on the 21st, for the purpose of delivering his credentials.—None of the expected Ministerial resignations had yet actually occurred, but that of M. Burgos was still spoken of, and it was once more said that M. Imaz, the new Minister of Finance, also wished to retire, on account of his great age.—The convocation of the Cortes is hardly alluded to in the letters of the 27th, and the little said of it does not enable us to judge of what is intended, or whether any final decision had yet been taken.

Four o'clock.

Nothing further has transpired in reference to the resignation of the Duke de Broglie. The minority in which he and his colleagues were left yesterday has not acted so powerfully on the movement of the funds as was expected previously to the opening of the Bourse. The 3 per cents declined only 25 centimes, and afterwards recovered to that extent, and remained steady. Z.

CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES—SITTING OF APRIL 1st.—M. Dupin, President, in the Chair.

The debate was resumed on the project of a law relative to the treaty between France and the United States.

M. A. Delamartine, after some general reflections upon the imperial diplomacy, which he said, in default of reasons made use of gendarmes, and tore the Pope from the alter of St. Peter's, and the Spanish Monarchs from their royal residences at Madrid, entered, upon the question before the Chamber, and said the only question to be decided was, if we were or not debtors of the United States. In his opinion the debt was established; for during seventeen years it has been under examination and discussion, and the only man whom France and the U. States could choose as arbiters General Lafayette, has declared that he most conscientiously believes, that 30,000,000f. at least are due to the Americans. (Exclamations of various kinds.) The hon. deputy concluded by saying that the rejection of the project might produce a hostile disposition on the part of the Americans, and lead to the most disastrous results for our commerce.

M. Dupont made to me observations with regard to the questions of public right involved in the project of law, which he voted against.

M. Duchatel expressed an opinion similar to that already put forward by some of the preceding speakers—that the advantages reaped by the Americans by the carrying trade during the war between England and France could, under no point of view, be considered as compensation for the injury done to others by the decrees of Milan and Berlin. The debt, he added, was the result of injustice—an injustice not attempted to be denied—an injustce which was not the effect of war, but which was committed in time of peace, for there was no war between France and the United States. On the other hand, the advantages said to be gained by the Americans were not of our creating, but were the results of good fortune or favorable chance which crowned enterprises where they risked all to gain something.

With regard to the importance of the cession of Louisiana, the hon. deputy observed that our rights to that territory were contested and

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0908.jpg