House of Representatives,
February 9, 1839.

Sir: If you were present on the 17th Jan. 1839, when Mr. Stanley of North Carolina replied to some remarks made by me on the resolution to appoint a committee to inquire into the defalcations of Samuel Swartwout, will you have the goodness to state what time Mr. Stanley occupied in making his reply? Whether Mr. Slade of Vermont did, or did not, hand him (Stanley) a paper containing my answer to some Abolition interrogatories, and whether Mr. Slade did, or did not, point out to Mr. Stanley such passages of said answer as Mr. Stanley exhibited in his reply.

Your attention to this, will much oblige your friend, A. DUNCAN.

Hon. H. L. Turney.

House of Representatives,
February—. 1839.

Sir: I have received your note of the 9th of this month, and in answer thereto have the honor to state that I was in my seat in the House of Rep. on the 17th of January last. I heard your speech delivered in the House on that day, on the subject to which you refer, and the reply thereto of the Hon. Mr. Stanley of North Carolina, on the same day. I did not tax my recollection with the precise time occupied by Mr. Stanley in making his reply, but my impression is it did not exceed fifteen or twenty minutes.

In the course of Mr. Stanley's remarks, I understood him to make allusions to a letter which he alleged had been written by you on the subject of Abolitionism. He regretted that he had not the letter to read to the House. In a few seconds after this, my attention was directed to Mr. Stanley by some gentlemen who sat near me, and who called my attention to the fact, that Mr. Slade was prompting Mr. Stanley, by pointing out to him certain parts of your letter, to be read by him to the House. I have no knowledge how or from whom Mr. Stanley received the letter above referred to.

I am, sir, respectfully yours &c.
H. L. TURNEY.

Hon. A. Duncan.

House of Representatives,
Feb. 9, 1839.

Sir: Were you in the House on the 17th January, 1839, when I made some remarks on the resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the defalcation of Samuel Swartwout, or were you present when Mr. Stanley of North Carolina replied to me? If so, will you be so good as to state, first, if Mr. Slade of Vermont did, or did not, hand him (Stanley) a paper containing my letter in answer to some Abolition interrogatories? Second, state whether Mr. Slade, did, or did not, stand by him (Stanly) and prompt or point out such passages of said letter as were exhibited in his reply? Third, will you state what time Stanly occupied in his reply, and whether or not the greater portion of that time was occupied in reading portions of the letter above alluded to?

Your attention to this, will much oblige,
Yours, &c.
A. DUNCAN.

Hon. J. A. Bynum.

Washington City,
10th Feb. 1839.

Sir: In reply to your note of the 9th inst. and the questions therein contained, I can only say that I was present, and heard the concluding part of your remarks on the occasion alluded to; after which, I saw Mr. Stanley rise, and heard his reply.

I did not see Mr. Slade hand Mr. Stanley the paper containing your letter on the subject of Abolition. Mr. Slade has informed me since, however, that he did hand Mr. Stanly such a paper at the time alluded to by you.

While Mr. S. was speaking, I saw Mr. Slade standing by, or behind Mr. Stanly, pointing, as I thought, at different paragraphs in the paper held by Mr. S. As to the last question, I think I heard Mr. Stanly say, in concluding his few remarks, that he had not addressed the House more than fifteen minutes, and I think that about the time he did speak.

With respect, I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,
J. A. BYNUM.

Hon. A. Duncan.

I think I am sustained in the fact which I have asserted, viz: that "the speech of Mr. Stanly of North Carnlina, in reply to Dr. Duncan," &c never was made in the House of Representatives, or, if made, must have been made in the *short space of "fifteen minutes!"* But even all *that* time was not occupied in making the speech purporting to be the reply to "Dr. Duncan." When I charged upon the member a base falsehood, &c. for making the insinuation which he did, some part of the fifteen was occupied in denying that he had insinuated that I was an Abolitionist. Here is where the member showed the white feather. That denial was but a squirming from under the responsiblity of answering in an honorable way the charge of being guilty of base falsehood. A part of the balance of these precious fifteen minutes, (and a great part, too,) was occupied in reading garbled extracts from a letter which I wrote in answer to some Abolition interrogatories propounded to me shortly before my reelection. The member first regretted that he had not the letter in his possession; but it was soon furnished. Who furnished it?—Mr. Slade of Vermont. Ah! Mr. Slade, I am happy to meet you on this board of expositon. I have been talking all this time about (to use a vulgar phrase) the little end of nothing;" a thing that requires the use of a telescope to see if it be at any considerable distance, hardly the ninth part of a man; a thing that the Almighty never intended for any other purpose than the use of the bodkin, shears and thimble. But you, sir, are a man six feet five in your shoes. I feel a freedom in talking to you; and, in order to have a full and ample case, I will splice the member from North Carolina to you, and for a short time will consider you one person, or in "*cahoot*," and in that capacity I will hold myself responsible to you for all I say.

You profess to be an Abolitionist, religiously, morally, patriotically and civilly, a modern Abolitionist; even so, I have been told, to *amalgamationism*. You furnished the member from North Carolina, did you, with my answer to the Abolitionists, from which to read garbled extracts? You stood at his elbow, did you, prompting him, and pointing out suitable passages of my letter, to enable him to make an anti Abolition speech, and attach to my name that of Abolitionism? Only think of this! A rank Abolition Whig from the North in "*cahoot*" with a rank anti-Abolition *Whig* from the South; in exposnig the pernicious doctrine contained in a letter which deprecates slavery in the *abstract*, or rather, a Northern Abolition Whig, making a convenience and a parrot of a Southern abolitionist, through which to expose the dangerous tendencies of an expression of hostility to slavery in the abstract, and its effects, without regard to time or place! What base sophistry! what black hypocricy! what political swindling for base and corrupt party purposes!

Yes, black hypocricy, take it as you may. If I am an Abolitionist, why should the member from Vermont lend himself to make me odious to the slaveholding people? Or, if the member from Vermont is sincere in his profession of Abolitionism, why is he assisting and promting an anti Abolitionist to expose opinions of mine, to the prejudice of the principles of his faith? If the member from North Carolina is sincere in his profession of anti-Abolitionism, why does he permit himself to be made the tool of an avowed Abolitionist? All this unnatural connection is well understood. Abolitionism and Whiggery, like twin brothers, walk hand and hand here and every where else. There is not an *ism* on earth, however degraded, that Whigery will not take by the hand. Here we have the evidence of the submission and acknowledgement into which the member from North Carolina was either kicked or coaxed by party discipline, evidenced by the following letter, by which the member from North Carolina is made publicly to retract a charge which he had made against the member from Vermont, and to declare, publicly, that he [Stanly] believes that the open, avowed and reckless Abolitionist, [Slade,] "means no harm to the South." But read the letter. "Here it is:

TO THE EDITORS.

Washington, Dec. 14, 1838.

Messrs. Gales and Seaton:—In the Intelligencer of this morning I find the following report:

"Mr. Slade introduced the following resolution:

"Whereas there exists, and is carried on between the ports in the District of Columbia and other ports of the United States, and under the sanction of the laws thereof, a trade in human beings, whereby thousands of them are annually sold and transported from said District, to distant parts of the country, in vessels belonging to citizens of the United States; and whereas, such trade involves an outrageous violation of human rights, is a disgrace to the country by whose laws it is sanctioned, and calls for the immediate interposition of legislative authority for its suppression.

'Therefore, to the end that all obstacles to the consideration of this subject may be removed, and a remedy for the evil speedily provided.

'Resolved, That so much of the fifth of the resolutions on the subject of slavery, passed by this House on the 11th and 12th of the present month, as relates to 'the removal of slaves from State to State,' & prohibits the action of this House on 'every petition, memorial, resolution, proposition, or paper, touching the same, be. and hereby is, rescinded."

After which, it is reported that "Mr. Dawson called for the reading of the resolution; which having been again read, Mr. Stanly said he wished to introduce an amendment. The Chair said it was not now in order, the resolution not yet being in the possession of the House."

When Mr. Slade's resolutions were read, and I heard the words "outrageous violation of human rights" and "disgraceful" applied, as I thought, to the slaveholding States and to North Carolina as one of them, I could not repress the indignation I felt at such language. It was under the influence of this excitement that I wished to "introduce an amendment," when the Chair said it was not not now in order."

The amendment I wished to introduce was in the words following.

"Resolved, That said resolution is disrespectful in its language, and outrageously insulting to the Representatives of the slave holding States; that it is calculated to provoke and irritate the members from said States; and that the consideration of said resolution would be an 'outrageous violation' of the respect due to the slaveholding States, and would necessarily tend to weaken the bonds of our Union.

"Resolved, That said resolution is 'disgraceful' to the members who presents it, as it evinces a total disregard of the feelings of the Representatives of the slaveholding States of this Union, and does not deserve to be considered by the House."

But the rules of order; different at different times, prevented me from introducing this amendment, and I do not now regret it, as the resolution was not considered by the House, and as I have been since satisfied that though the language sounded harshly to the ears of a Representative from the South, nothing offensive was intended, and I write this note now, that my constituents may be informed what my amendment was; waiting for an hour of leisure, when I will inform them more fully why it was that I did not vote upon the resolutions recently offered by a member from New Hamshire.

I have good reasons for refusing to join in the miserable farce which has been played by the instruments of party in the House of Representavives during Tuesday and Wednesday last.

Oblige me by publishing this note.

Very respectfully yours,
EDWARD STANLEY.

Comment on this letter, it would seem, is unnecessary. The resolution of the member from Vermont not only strikes at the root of every interest the Southern States have in the institutions of slavery, but it uses the most degrading and abusive language that a foul tongue could express, or a poisoned pen record; and so the member from North Carolina virtually expresses himself; but, either from being whipped into the traces by force of party discipline, or from cowardice unworthy a son of the South, whose heart ought to be in her interests, and her reputation his boast, he is forced to the degrading *public* acknowledgement that nothing offensive to the South was intended by the member from Vermont! I think as the people of North Carolina will understand this matter, it is useless for me to expand upon it.

But a word in relation and in justice to myself. A few days prior to my re election, several interrogateries were propounded to me on the subject of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and I. probably on the spur of the occason, answered them without time for reflection, or opportunity for examination; but I am to say that on mature examination, I have not one word, contained in that letter, to take back, as it regards slavery in the abstract or Abolitionism. When I wrote that letter I felt as I wrote. I wrote as I now feel, and as I hope always to feel on the subject of slavery in the abstract, and as thousands and hundreds of thousands of the beast men the world ever produced, have thought, and now think both in free and in slave States.

My remarks in that letter were made with reference to slavery in all time, present, past and future, and without reference to any particular realm, kingdom, empire, or republic; and I now say, that the man who will otherwise express himself to this general view of the subject of slavery in the abstract, is no philanthropist, is no friend to human liberty, and would be unworthy the proud name of an American.

My objections to modern Abolitionits, are strongly expressed in the same letter. I there deprecate it as disorganizing in its tendencies—in violation of the compact by which the Union was brought into existence, and, if persisted in, will endanger its duration. My official course since, has been in accordance with the view I then entertained of it. I voted to suspend the rule for the admission of Mr. Atherton's resolutions, for the object and contents of which I refer the reader to the journals of the House of Representatives for the present session of Congress. A motion for adjournment was then made by Mr Bell, at the early hour of half past one o'clock, p. m. evidently for the purpose of defeating the adoption of the resolutions. I voted against the adjournment; but the member from North Carolina, (Stanly) voted in favor of the adjournment. I voted throughout for the adoption of these resolutions, with the exception of the last division of the last resolution, which goes to prevent the reading, printing and reference of petitions on the subject of Abolitionism. This I thought impolitic, and well calculated to multiply petitions and petitioners on this vexed question, because such a disposition never fails to raise the cry of persecution. I also thought that such a disposition of petitions was a violation of the right of petition as secured by the Constitution; for, surely, to prevent and refuse legislative action upon them, is virtually to prostrate the right to petition. To recognise the right to petition Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, (which Congress does by receiving petitions for that purpose,) and at the same time, and by the same act, refuse them the usual legislative action, is worse than contemptuous mockery of the right to petition.

I hold that the people have a right to petition Congress for the redress of every grievance not forbidden by the Constitution. I hold that the people are, and of right ought to be, the judges of what they shall petition for; and I hold it follows, as a corollary, that Congress is bound to give petitions the proper and usual direction, to the end that they may receive that legislative action which the framers of the Constitution intended they should, when they secured inviolate the right of petition It seems to me that good policy, and a sound interpretation of the Constitution require that such should be the disposition of all petitions.

I voted for Mr. Atherton's resolutions, because I thought the reserved and constitutional rights of the Southern States demanded their adoption. I voted for them, because I thought the peace and quiet of the country required it. I voted for them, because, as I have before said, I think the practical operation of the principles of modern Abolitionism would be more fatal to the unfortunate African than even slavery itself as it at present exists in the United States; and, therefore, I can consider modern Abolitionism in no other light than as mistaken philanthropy.—I voted for their adoption, because I am not clear that Congress has any such power over the District of Columbia, as to abolish slavery within its limits. But above all, I voted for them, because I think the purpetuity of this Union, and the duration of our institutions required that they should all be adopted, with the exception of that part of the last resolution which I before excepted.

I say I stood by and sustained these resolutions, voting for them against all the efforts to defeat them by the opposition; but where was the member from North Carolina, at this trying moment? I have examined the journals; the name of Edward Stanly is not to be found. Where was he, I ask, when the Northern Democracy rallied almost to a man to put at rest a question that was shaking the institutions of his State from their centre to their circumference, and endangering the very existence of the Union itself? I repeat, where was the member at this responsible crisis? Was he at his post, sustaining the interests of his State, which he said on one occasion not long since, had "grown with HIS growth!! strengthened with HIS strength!! No, he was not at his post. He was, spaniel like, skulking from his duty and his post, at the nod of party discipline; but, when backed and prompted by the Abolitionist, Slade, he assumed all the pertness of a whiffet, hissed on, puppy-like, to do that which a bigger dog had not the courage to attempt.

But to conclude, people of North Carolina, (for this paper may find its way to you,) what do you think of your Representative, who has attempted to practice a base fraud and a mean deception upon you by promulgating a speech among you, purporting to have been delivered by him in the House of Representatives, which never was delivered, and though a disgrace—delivered or written—to any man but the member from North Carolina, he has neither the moral courage nor the talent to deliver. What do you think of your Representative, who has patiently stood to be charged with the base falsehood and foul detraction with impunity, and who, to skulk from the responsibility of resenting such an insult, has basely denied that every word written in that which he is pleased to call his speech, bears evidence, thus addressing, I repeat, base falsehood to mean cowardice. What do you think of your Representative who has skulked from the support of measures, (I mean Atherton's resolutions,) introduced for the purpose of putting to rest that dangerous question, modern Abolitionism, so eminently calculated to disturb the peace and harmony of this Union, and to prostrate or shake the institutions of the member's State, whose interests have 'grown with his growth! and strengthened with his strength!

But, above all, what do you think of your Representative, who has permitted himself to be made the tool, the catspaw, the thing, the automaton, and the parrot, through which an open and avowed Abolitionist should make an anti-Abolition speech? An anti Abolition speech through your Representative! and that too, by an Abolitionist! yes, and, I believe, an amalgamation Abolitionist, too, a man who has spent or evaporated thousands of dollars on the floor of Congress in efforts to establish principles and laws subversive of your institutions, in violation of your reserved rights as a State, and disorganizing, if not destructive, to the Union, and so far as amalgamation is concerned, or is a part of his creed, degrading to the American character. This is the man from whom your Representative receives promptings, papers, and dictations, to fix upon me the character of an Abolitionist! and to expose the horrors, injustice, and dangers of modern Abolitionism!

A. DUNCAN.

House of Representives,
February 12, 1839.

Sir: In a letter written by me in answer to some interrogatories propounded to me on the subject of Abolitionism, by a number of members of the Anti-Slavery Society in the district I have the honor to represent, I deprecate slavery in the abstract, and I attempt, to some extent, to describe the effects it has upon the institions and prospects of those countries and States where it exists. I also, in the same letter, deprecate modern Abolitionism as dangerous and disorganizing, subversive of the reserved rights of the slave States, and calculated to endanger the Union &c. All in that letter that I said in relation to slavery, was intendod to apply to slavery in the abstract; also to apply to slavery and its effects in all time past, present, and future. I gave no locations. My objections and descriptions were of the most general character. I see in a speech published in the National Intelligencer, purporting to be a speech made by "Mr. Stanly of North Carolina, in reply to Dr. Duncan, &c." he is made to ask, in substance, if the ruin and desolation, &c. which I describe in the letter above named, applies to your district, &c. You are made to respond, "No; it is a foul libel, a base slander upon my constituents and upon my State." If you made such a remark, I did not hear it or I would have responded to it at the time. I presume you made it.—Now, sir, if you read my letter, you must have seen that my *objections* to slavery have reference to slavery in the abstract, and applied to slavery, as I have before said, in all time; and my description of its effects had no location. You had no right to suppose that my description of the effects of slavery applied to your State, or your district, where it is well know, it is a matter of history creditable to your State, that slavery exists in its mildest and most unexceptionable form I say, if you had read my letter, you would have had no grounds to warrant the remark you are said to have made.

If you never read the letter; and know nothing of its contents, only from the base and unmanly manner in which its garbled fragment have been exhibited, you are wholly unjustifiable in your remark. You made the remark under the broad and protective shield of parliamentary privilege. You have not the moral courage to face me, or any other man, and make such a remark, without the protection of such a privilege. It is a shield and privilege under which many a puppy, in man's shape, has taken refuge.

I think your remarks were unwarranted, uncalled for, and unprovoked. And, sir, on my own responsibility, and without claim to privilege, permit me, by way of offset and compromise, to reciprocate the remark by another, which I think better founded in truth—that is, that you are a liar and a scoundrel, and permit me to add, also, that in my opinion, you are better qualified to adorn the gambler's board, the brothel, and the dogery, than the halls of Congress.

A. DUNCAN.

To William Southgate, esq.

LATEST FROM THE EAST.

THE BOUNDARY.

A passenger from Bangor last night, brings a report that Mr. McLaughlin, the British Land Agent, had been taken by the Americans, and safely deposited at Bangor. It is also said that Sir John Harvey, has sent on an express with a message to Governor Fairfield, stating that if our men are not withdrawn from the disputed territory, he shall expel them.

The Legislsture of Maine, with the most gratifying unanimity, immediately passed an appropriation of *eight thousand dollars* for the expenses of defending our soil from foreign aggression. Two thousand men have been ordered out, which number promptly volunteered, from among the best material for troops to be found in the country. The number will be raised to *ten thousand* if necessary.

Large purchases were made in this city yesterday, of beef, pork, bread, blankets, and other articles for the service.

It does a man's heart good to see the energy displayed by Gov. Fairfield. We shall hear from Governor Edward Everett to-morrow or next day.—*Massachusetts owns halt the land.*

FROM AUGUSTA,

[Correspondence of the Advertiser.]

Marching of Troops—Orders of the Governor—Militia called out, &c.

Sunday, Augusta, Feb. 17, 1839.

Messrs. Editors:—Mr. Stanley has paraded his company this morning in and about the Kennebec Hotel. It looks here like any thing but Sunday. As I am writing, I can hear the word of command from without—*front face, right about, &c.* There were no Sundays in the revolution, and there is none here this morning. All is bustle and confusion—horses, carriages, men and munitions of war, all preparing for the Aroostook country, which is soon to become the seat of war. An express arrived last night about 12 O'clock, bearing a proclamation of Sir John Harvey, which breathes a little of war. He says the timber and territory shall be protected, and calls upon his loyal subjects to be in readiness for the battle. This is surely talking pretty large. Our Governor was called from his peaceful slumbers at dead of night to hear this tocsin of war sounded. I understand he immediately issues orders to call out the third division of the militia, and they will probably repair to the borders to protect our citizens and territory. Things this morning really wear the aspect of war. If the Provincial authorities intend to take the disputed territory into their keeping, there will be but *one opinion* in Maine; and I hope but *one* in the whole Union; and that is, to battle for our rights. We will not be trifled with any longer. There is a spirit in the American people which will not brook insult from Sir John Harvey or the British Queen, and this fact they will soon learn if they persist in their unrighteous claims. If England is determined to hold on to this territory, then let us have war, if we must. We *cannot*—we *will not* yield our rights to any foreign power. Our Governor ought to send forthwith to Washington, and call upon the General Government to come to the rescue.

E PLURIBUS UNUM

CAMBRIDGE:

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1839.

The present session of Congress closes to day.

The present Senatorial Canvass.—The time has been so short, since the resignation of Mr. Eccleston, that it is not probable there will be a full turnout of the voters of the county. Our right worthy friends, the whigs, seem to be a good deal alarmed and apprehensive about the result.—This is amusing enough, when it is known that their majority has usually been from 2 to 300. We wish at least to maintain our relative strength, and if possible to beat the whig candidate.—If the whigs labor under a panic, it is a gone case with them, to a dead certainty. Burnt brandy would not save them. It is not probable however, that we shall beat them more than 500 votes.

Swartwout Committee.—Mr. Harlem, Chairman of the Committee appointed by Congress to investigate the defalcations of Swartwout, late Collector at N. York, has made a report, from the majority. Mr. Owens of Georgia, from the minority of the same Committee, has also made a report. We have not seen either of these Documents, and therefore can form no opinion of their character.

We have received the report of Mr. Page, Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, made in the House of Delegates, on February 15th last. We have not yet had time to look over the interesting document, carefully, and therefore cannot speak of its merits.

We understand that the Legislature of Virginia have indefinitely postponed the election of a U. States Senator.

Great excitement prevades the State of Maine, in consequence of the difficulties, about the North Eastern Boundary of that State. The British authorities, have been taking upon themselves grounds, which cannot be sustained, and any attempt on their part to take possession of the disputed territory, while the matter was under negociation and settlement between the two countries, is wholly indifensable, and a breach of amity and good faith. The mother country will not probably, sustain these efforts of her colonial functionaries. The President has sent a Message to Congress, upon the subject—We have seen the document, but have not had the opportunity to look into it carefully, together with the accompaning papers. We understand the President sustains the course of Maine, and that the grounds taken by her authorities, and by the administration, will be probably justified, unanimously by Congress. From the state of good feeling and friendship generally existing between this country and Great Britain, we cannot believe that a war can grow out of this grave subject. Every patriot, no matter in what quarter of our vast Republic, should be ready to stand by, the citizens of Maine, and the General Government, in the protection of her rights under the treaty of peace guaranteed to her, by the Constitution of the United States. Matters look squally—there is no telling how they will terminate.

It is astonishing that the Chronicle should be so reckless in its assertions, notwithstanding all admonitions to the contrary. Truth is a most noble virtue, and even in the warmest conflicts of party, should be respected and venerated, as a terrestrial divinity. As that paper takes the liberty of accusing us of party mendacity, and that too, not in the most respectful terms, one would certainly expect a greater regard to accuracy in its assertions. That press states in the most positive terms, that "Mr. Stewart's tickets and addresses were prepared anterior to Monday last."—What will the public think of the decent respect for the truth on the part of that paper, when they are informed that Mr. Stewart's "tickets and addresses" were not prepared nor printed until *Tuesday night last.* Certain of the whigs of this county are the last men in this world, to talk of shuffling or manœuvering.—Was the fact of Mr. Eccleston having resigned, not kept a profound secret from us as long as possible, in order to give Mr. Goldsborough, (the *protege* of certain whigs, who have kindly taken that gentleman into their sacred keeping,) the start of any other candidate, either on our side, or their own? This, we suppose, was all fair, in the estimation of our honest opponents.—The fact is, Mr. Goldsborough himself, and other leading whigs, were apprized publicly, that there would be a candidate on our side, as late as Monday last. This paper publicly urged upon our friends the propriety of our running a candidate.—Now forsooth, when the whigs find they are loosing ground and the magic of their charms is broken in this county, and many of their leading men are deserting them, they are seized with an awful panic—the certain harbinger of *ultimate* defeat. The Chronicle very wittily, alludes to the fable of the spider, climbing up ninety times, perseveringly, and very appropriately to be sure, applies this to our candidate.—Why, sir, there is another property of the industrious spider; he can successfully weave his web, and catch every buzzing fly that passes his well woven net, and play with the little insect as long as he pleases, then leave him to dry up, suspended in mid air, where the writhing creature may have an opportunity to look down upon all terrestrial things, with the most sovereign contempt. Perseverance certainly is a most laudable quality—never to faulter in a good cause, is an excellent motto. If the Chronicle would persevere