L. D. Joackli

DORCHESTER AURORA.

"PRINCIPLES AND MEASURES, AND MEN BY THEIR PRINCIPLES."

VOL. 4. CAMBRIDGE, MD.—MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1839. NO. 36.

DORCHESTER AURORA,
EDITED AND PRINTED BY
WM. H. BARROW.

TERMS.

The "AURORA" is published every Monday at $2 50 a year, one-half to be paid upon the receipt of the first number. Subscribers may discontinue the paper at any time by paying for the time they have received it, but not without, except with the assent of the Editor.

Advertisements not exceeding a square, inserted three times for $1 00; each after insertion 25 cents—when larger, in proportion.

Advertisements continued until instructed to omit them and charged accordingly.

Communications addressed to the Editor, must be post paid.

A NEW SERIES.

A desirable opportunity for New Subscribers.

The Fourth Volume of the
GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE
AND
AMERICAN MONTHLY REVIEW,
will commence on the 1st of Jan. 1839.

Terms.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Two large volumes of nearly one thousand pages are published every year.

This popular work will in future, be printed with *NEW TYPE CAST EXPRESSLY FOR THE PURPOSE*, on fine thick paper, well stitched in a neat cover.

☞*Valuable Engravings will be frequently given.*

The Gentleman's Magazine and American Monthly Review has attained a standing that insures its continuance; and the commendatory notices of the most respectable portion of the press attest its merits and popularity.—Each monthly number contains Seventy-two, extra-sized Octavo pages, and presents MORE READING MATTER THAN A VOLUME OF A NOVEL. It is published at little more than half the price of any other Magazine in the United States, yet contains as many ORIGINAL PAPERS as any other Monthly Publication

WM. E. BURTON, Editor & Proprietor,
Philadelphia.

The following distinguished Writers fill the pages of the Gentleman's Magazine with Original Contribution.

Professor Ingraham, author of The South West, Lafitte, Burton, etc. Captain Marryatt, author of Peter Simple, Japhet, Jacob Faithful, etc. Miss Catharine H. Waterman, Philadelphia. "The American Hemans."—The Hon. R. T. Conrad, Philadelphia.—David Hoffman, Baltimore. George Walters, Esq., Washington. James F. Otis, Boston and Washington. Mrs Fanny Kemble Butler, Philadelphia. Leigh Hunt, England.—Morton M'Michael, Philadelphia. C. F. Wines, author of Two Two Years in the Navy. Letters from Boston, etc. Andrew M'Makin and Ezra P. Holden, Editors of Saturday Courier, Philadelphia. Douglas Jerrald, author of the Rent Day, etc., England. J. F. Elder, Editor of the Columbia Spy, Pa. J. Houston Miffin, Philadelphia. James Montgomery, author of Satan, England.—Joseph C. Neal, author of Charcoal Sketches, Philadelphia. The author of An Actor's Alloquy. J. Hall Bready, Philadelphia. N. C. Brooks, Editor of Monthly Museum, Baltimore. John Frost, Professor of Belles Letters, Philadelphia. E. Pinckney Morton, Bangor, Me. Joseph Price, late Editor of New York Mirror. William Landor, Philadelphia. T. G. Spear, Philadelphia. L. A. Wilmer, Baltimore. Richard Penn Smith, author of the Disowned, Caius Marius, etc.—Alexander Dimitry, Washington. A. Harlbut, Pa. Thomas Dunn English, Pa. J. Ashbel Green, Phila. John Jones, Baltimore. Philander S. Rutter, A. M., Pa.—Charles P. Illsley, Editor of the Portland Transcript, Maine.

ETC. ETC ETC.

The Review Department of the Gentleman's Magazine, which has elicited praise from all points of the literary circle, will continue to present a complete account of the popular literature of the day, with liberal extract from rare and popular works. Translations from the lighter portions, of the French, German, Spanish and Italian authors, occur in every number. *Copious and Anecdotal Biographies of eminent men of the day, with Engraved Likenesses*, will frequently ornament the pages of the Gentleman's Magazine.

The Editor respectfully requests attention to the following list of the various popular articles which have been published in regular monthly series during the progress of the existing volumes—most of these papers are still continued, besides the general variety of the contents,—

The experience of a Modern Philosopher.
A Series of Tales entitled Leaves from a Life in London.
Poets and their Poetry, with Biographical and Critical Notices.
Pages from the Diary of a Philadelphia Lawyer, by an eminent Member of the the Bar, Play-House People, by the author of an Actor's Alloquy.
Unpublished Portions of the Life of Vidocq, the celebrated French Minister of Police.
Mirabilia Exempla, by a Metropolitan.
Extracts from the Journal of a Passenger from Philadelphia to New Orleans, by Professor Ingraham.
Scissible from the Blank Book of a Bibliographer, presenting many rare and valuable details.
Biographies, in full, of Commodore Stewart, with a Portrait and view of a Sea Fight.
Biographies, in full, of Zingham, the Negro Queen.
Biographies, in full, of Boz, Dickens, with a Portrait.
Biographies, in full, of Prince Puckler Muskau, the celebrated German Traveller.
Biographies, in full, of Pagnanini, with a Portrait.
Biographies, in full, of John Reeve.
Biographies, in full, of Dr. John Faust, the German Sorcerer.
Biographies, in full, of the Duchess of St. Albans, formerly Mrs. Coutts.

The Second and Third Volumes, of nearly one thousand pages, contain
THE CELEBRATED ANNIVERSARY REGISTER, & *Monthly Calendar of American Chronology.* Complete for every day in the year.

Subscribers, forwarding a Five Dollar Bill, may command a year's subscription and the remittance of these two volumes, in numbers, by the mail. Or any friend, or well-wisher, transmitting the names of Five, or more subscribers, at Three Dollars each, will receive the two volumes for 1838, containing the Calendar free of expense.

For the convenience of subscribers, various combinations have been formed, wherein the transmission of a Five Dollar bill will save material trouble.

A Five Dollar bill of par value, will command Two years' subscription to the Gentleman's Magazine—or two copies for one year, if sent to one direction.

A Five Dollar bill, of par value, will command one year's subscription to the Gentleman's Magazine, and one years subscription to the Lady's Book, published in Philadelphia, by Mr. Godney, at Three Dollars per annum.

A Five Dollar bill, of par value, will command one year's subscription to the Gentleman's Magazine, and, one years subscription to any of the popular Weekly Papers published in Philadelphia; and the proprietor pledges himself that both periodicals shall be duly forwarded to the given directions. By this means, subscribers at a distance may save postage and discount, and depend upon the receipt of their chosen works.

A Ten Dollar bill, at par value, will command two copies of the Gentleman's Magazine for two years, commencing with the first number, and ending next July—a series of four volumes to each copy. Clubs of Ten and upwards will be allowed the usual agency, if the numbers are sent, free of expense, to one direction: thus, Ten Subscribers, receiving the work in one monthly parcel, will be charged but Twenty Dollars if the money be sent in advance, and free from postage and discount.

Single copies of the Gentleman's Magazine cannot be obtained. A year's subscription must be paid: and at the termination of the time paid for and agreed upon, the subscriber must intimate his intention of discontinuance, or pay the ensuing year upon demand.

Postmasters and other Agents allowed the most liberal commission.

Editors of Newspapers are requested to oblige us with a few insertions of our advertisement, and accept the Magazine for regular notice; a copy of the papers containing notice or advertisement is requested to be sent to the Editor—but a regular exchange is not solicited, as Newspapers sent to Magazines are liable to postage.

SPEECH OF MR. DUNCAN,
OF OHIO,

In the House of Representatives, January 17, 1839—On the resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the defalcations of Samuel Swartwout.

(CONTINUED.)

What is the course of the Federaltsts when and where they have the ascendency? So far as my experience goes in my State, the Federalists clear the chess board of every man who is tainted with Democracy, whenever they have the ascendency, when it can be done without prejudice to their party. I have been informed that, under the late Federal Ritner power, almost every Democrat went by the board, who came under the Exexutive control, even down to the laborers on the public works. I may be in error; if so, some gentleman from Pennsylvania can correct me. I have little doubt but that the Federal reformation system will be carried to the full extent in New York, during the short time the new powers will be permitted to flutter in that State.

But, sir, let us examine this subject with a becoming care. Such has been the constant murmuring about the office holders, and the spoils party, that many of the honest and unsuspecting people of this country not only think that there are ten officers to one that is necessary, and that they are devouring the substance of the people, but that all the officers of this Government belong to the Democratic party. Such was the impression made upon my mind by the continual charge kept up by the Opposition. I have recently taken some pains to examine how the matter stands, and, by information, furnished me, which, I think may be relied upon with tolerable certainty, the Federalists are the spoils party. There may be some errors on both sides of the calculation, but the errors on one side will probably neutralise or off set the other. Here is a table consisting of two columns, one headed Federalists and the other Democrats: each represent the Departments with the aggregate number of officers of the party to which they belong, and the aggregate amount of salaries paid to the officers and clerks, including the heads of Departments. But, sir, lest I should be misunderstood, it is proper to remark that I have no apology to offer for the office holders. I would rather be a comfortable and easy office holder, than a hungry lean office seeker. I think the former far before the latter.

LAND OFFICE.

Feds.	Amount.	Democrats.	Amount.
50	$56,200	48	$56,950
GENERAL POST OFFICE.			
11	14,600	48	65,980
AUDITOR'S OFFICE.			
25	31,200	30	38,075
TREASURY DEPARTMENT.			
10	12,000	15	19,450
REGISTER'S OFFICE.			
24	27,050	none	
FIRST COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE.			
13	12,250	4	7,500
SECOND COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE.			
9	12,500	2	1,950
FIRST AUDITOR'S OFFCE.			
5	4,500	11	14,400
SECOND AUDITOR'S OFFICE.			
12	15,000	5	5,900
FOURTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE.			
8	9,700	8	10,550
FIFTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE.			
8	11,700	1	1,150
TREASURER'S OFFICE.			
8	11,750	3	3,200
SOLICITOR'S OFFICE.			
3	2,800	2	4,650
STATE DEPARTMENT.			
10	37,800	4	10,385
Aggre.	$269,065		$239,140
	239,140		
In favor of Federalists -	$29,925		

The War, Navy, and Patent Office Departments are not embraced in this estimate. I feel assured that in those Departments there will be found to be a large majority of Federalists with proportionate salaries. I have no doubt but a large proportion of the United States judiciary, officers of the army and navy, and other United States officers, are opposed to the Administration. I have assurances for what I say from those who speak the truth, and understand what they say. As a portion of this information, I ask leave to read a letter and answer which I hold in my hand:

House of Representatives,
January 17, 1839.

DEAR SIR: If not inconsistent with any rule you may have laid down for your official or policical conduct, I would be pleased if you would inform me,

1st, Of the number of postmasters in the United States.

2d, The aggregate amount of salary they receive in the year.

2d. What proportion of them are supporters of the present Administration.

Should it not be in your power to answer this interrogatory with accuracy, inform me what you suppose to be the probable number.

I am yours, with high respect,
A. DUNCAN.

Hon. A. KENDALL, *Postmaster General.*

To this communication I received the following answer.

Washington, January 17, 1839.

SIR: I perceive no objection to answering unofficially your letter of the 17th instant.—I, therefore, annex replies to your several interrogatories.

1. "What number of postmasters there are in the United States?"

The number of postmasters in the United States, on the first day of December last, was 12,553.

2. "The aggregate amount of salary they receive in the year?"

The compensation of postmasters for the year ending with the 20th June, 1838, varied little from $921,034.

3. "What proportion of them are supporters and friends of the present Administration?"

I have not information which will enable me to classify the postmasters, politically.—Although, in making appointments, friends of the Administration are preferred to enemies, when their politics are known, there are many cases in which the Department has no information on the subject, and it institutes no inquiries into the politics of incumbents. It is believed, however, that more than half the postmasters of tha United States are politically opposed to the Administration.

With high respect,
Your obedient servant,
AMOS KENDALL.

But sir, I come now to speak of the charges of corruption, profligacy, panic, and ruin, which have been rung in our ears until our hearing has been wounded and our stomach nauseated. This howl of panic, ruin, and corruption, has been a standing means used by the Federalists from the commencement of this Government to this time. It is a howl like that of no beast on the face of the earth but that which makes it. It is the howl of a demagouge, and is used for the purposes of political deception. It varies in its tone. It is sometimes boisterous and terrific; it is sometimes like the piteous and deceptive cry of the crocodile. It varies with the causes that operate upon the demagogues who make it. Sometimes it proceeds from a robust political desperado, but more generally from the lean, lingering, lank office seekers; and the time was when this howl had some effect with the people; but their howl of corruption, corruption! has become like the cry of wolf, wolf, wolf! The people know the object, and by whom the howl is made. They give it no attention. The charge of corruption, panic, and profligacy, and its repetition, constituted one half that was said by the Opposition at the last and the extra session, and cost the people of this Government more than Stephen Girard's estate was worth at his death. These charges against the Administration were considered and investigated by the people, and with a full knowledge of the facts upon which they were founded, and with a discriminating mind, and a sound judgment, which rarely ever errs, when unclouded by falsehood or undeceived by misrepresentation, have expressed a deliberate opinion, through the ballot boxes, that the charges of corruption, profligacy, and panic, are false. They are a base slander upon the Administration, and a lible upon *the people*, so far as *panic* is concerned, and made for political effect, to advance Federalism. But, sir, it is time for me to raise the general issue with the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. Prentiss,] and to present such facts as will sustain my plea. The gentleman, in the outset of his long speech, said that there were corruptions and base frauds committed by the officers of this Government, and that the Administration and the heads of Departments were cognisant of them, connived at them, and participated in them, and were morally involved in all the guilt and crime connected with them. This was his declaration; and that he would present such an array of facts in support of his charges, that no one dare contradict him, nor deny the charges that he had thus publicly, and from his place, made. Now, sir, I, on behalf of this Administration, join issue with the gentleman, and plead the *general* issue "not guilty."

I have seen and heard the *"array of facts"* which the gentleman has brought forward to sustain the charges contained in his declaration, and I heard with patience and attention the gentleman's comments upon his array of facts; and I *dare* say that the charges are not sustained. I dare say that the Administration, or the heads of Departments thereof, are not 'guilty.' I admit that abuses have existed, and frauds upon the Government committed by some of its officers. But I dare say the Administration, or the heads of Departments thereof, were not cognisant of them—did not participate in them—did not connive at them, and are not morally involved in the guilt connected with them; all these I *dare* say, and there are some other things I *dare* say. I *dare* say that more faithful, economical, and prudent Executive officers, so far as the heads of Departments are concerned, never administered this Government, than those of the present Administration. I *dare* say two thirds of all the public defaulters and fraudulent speculators, from the commencement of the Government to this time, and particularly in this and the last Administrations, were Federalists in principle, as they were scoundrels in practice, and violent opposers of the Democratic principle, party, & administrations.

Further, I dare say that there have been fewer official frauds and defalcations in this and the last Administrations, (and I speak with reference to the length of this Administration,) in proportion to the amount of public revenue collected and disbursed, by more than two hundred per cent. than existed under any preceding Administrations.

Frther, I *dare say* that more than nine-tenths of all the money out of which the government has been defrauded, originated by the banks and the connection of the Government with them, and with the importing merchants and the credit system—all darlings with the Federalists, and a part of the party and the whole of their policy. Sir, the charge of fraud and corruption is made upon the Administration generally, and particularly upon the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Woodbury. These are grave charges against high, distinguished and responsible officers of this Government, and if true, are matters of grave import, in which the whole community have the deepest interest. If those who make them are sincere, and make them in good faith, they are solemnly bound, by the nature of their oath and the duties of their office, to prefer articles of impeachment. But, sir, I *dare* say further, that that will not be done, although gentlemen say that Mr. Woodbury stands convicted by his own reports; yes, he stands convicted by evidence "out of his own mouth." Yet, sir, on behalf of Mr. Woodbury, and without conference with him, or his consent to throw down the glove, I challenge any member of this House to prefer articles of impeachment againt him. Sir, the opposition could do nothing which would please Mr. Woodbury better. Sir, there is no man in this House that would not recoil at the thought of the indignation of a liberal and an honest community that must rest upon the head of him who would be foolhardy enough to prosecute such an adventure upon an individual whose merits secure him so large a portion of the public confidence and good feeling. And as bantering, daring, and boisterous assertion is the order of the day, and one of the modes of argument in this House, and as I have as good a right to participate in this mode of discussion as any other member, I repeat the challenge—impeach Secretary Woodbury if you *dare*. But, sir, I proceed to sustain my plea, and the assertions I have *dared* to make in defence of this Administration, by facts and matters of record. But, first, let me call the attention of those who hear me, and those who may read me, that the President nominates all receiving, collecting, and disbursing officers; those who are the defaulters were nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Woodbury has no control over those appointments. If unprincipled men get into office, and the Government is defrauded thereby, it is unjust and unfair to hold the Secretary of the Treasury responsible; responsible for the conduct of officers, not of his appointing, and over whose conduct he has no control, except to detect them after a fraud has been committed, and to recommend their removal from office. Whatever moral or political evil may attach to the appointment of a fraudulent officer, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, neither the President nor the Secretary of the Treasury out to be held responsible; for, as I said, the Secretary has no absolute control over the appointment, and the President cannot be presumed to be acquainted with the merits, morals, integrity, and qualifications of the hundredth individual who is appointed to office, who may have a portion of the control of the public revenue. He must rely upon the recommendation of those who are acquainted with the applicant, and upon the Senate, who confirm his nominations, and who have fifty times the opportunity to know the qualifications of the nominees that the President has; their body consisting of that number, and their practical acquaintance coextensive with the Union.

But to proceed with my facts. In order to supersede the necessity of bringing a wheelbarrow load of documents here, to which I might refer to support my positions, I have taken some extracts from those documents, and noted the references, which I shall publish in my printed speech, for the benefit of those who may wish to refer to them.

The gentleman, to support his broad and unqualified charges of corruption and fraud; relied upon the defalcations of three individuals. Their names, offices, and locations were as follows, viz: Spencer, receiver at Fort Wayne, Harris and Boyd, receivers in Mississippi, and Linn, in Illinois. In order to know the facts about these public officers, I addressed the following note to the Secretary of the Treasury, viz:

House of Repre. Dec. 28, 1838.

Dear Sir: The President's Message is now under consideration in Committee of the Whole. Much blame is attached by the Opposition to the Administration, and particularly to your Department, (Treasury,) in consequence of some defalcations which appear in some of your official reports. The names of Spencer, receiver at Fort Wayne, Harris and Boyd, receivers in Mississippi, and Linn in Illinois, are principally relied on.

Will you have the goodness to inform me, by letter, what amount has been eventually lost by these officers? Your early attention to this request will oblige me, as I may find it necessary to make some reply to the unqualified abuse that is now poured forth upon the Administration and the Democratic party.

Very respectfully,
A. DUNCAN.

Hon. LEVI WOODBURY, Sec. Treasury.

To the above, I received the following in reply.

Treasury Department, Dec. 31, 1838.

Sir: In answer to your letter of the 28th inst. I would observe, that in the document No. 111, sent to the House of Representatives in January last, Mr. Harris, the receiver in note No. 48 on page 39, is stated to have paid part of his balance, and the remainder to be well secured.

In Mr. Boyd's case, it is understood that the balance is well secured and in the course of collection. Such is presumed to be the balance against Linn, it being in suit, and one of the sureties of the latter being Governor Duncan, of Illinois. He was not in default when re-appointed.

These officers were all dismissed, or they resigned, as soon as the balances against them, appearing in the current returns, were not paid over as directed, or satisfactory reasons not given for postponement.

Spencer is not, and never has been, a defaulter on the books, to my knowledge. He once delayed making a deposite, frombadness of the roads, but it was made as soon as they became passable.

I am, very respectfully, your ob't ser't,
LEVI WOODBURY.

Hon. A. DUNCAN.

Since the reception of this communication, I have examined the reports of defaulting officers, and find the statement, as here represented, true. It is due to the gentleman from Mississippi to say that the document he read from was calculated to mislead him: It did not contain the answers to the correspondence of the Secretary of the Treasury, nor does it contain the evidence of the final settlement of the Government with these individuals; nor the fact that they were removed when actually found to be in defalt, or to be wilfully violating any important order of the Treasury Department. So much for the cases of Spencer, Harris, Boyd and Linn, so much relied on to prove the guilt of fraud and corruption.

But I said this was an economical Administration. Sir, I refer you to the messages of the President and the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. One of the principal features in each, is a strong recommendation of economy in the expenditures of the Government. What is it, sir, that constitutes extravagance in our Government? Ii is the appropriation of money for purposes named in the act of appropriation beyond the amount of the Government estimates. The Secretary of the Treasury presents Congress with revenue estimates. Now what does extravagance consist in? Why, in appropriating money beyond the amount of the estimates, and beyond the amount of the income of the Government and her ability to pay. Who makes the appropriations? Why, Congress! Then, sir, when wo have large and extravagant Government expenditures, by which the people are oppressively taxed, who is to blame? Congress; and I hesitate not to say, (and I challenge an examination of the journals,) that, nine times in ten, the extravagant appropriations have been brought forward, sustained and carried, by a majority of the Federal members of Congress. Yes, sir, by the the very men who cry extravagance loudest.

But, sir, I said that more than two thirds of the Government defaulters were opposed to the Democratic party, etc. Sir, I hold in my hand a book containing the evidence of what I say—a list of public defaulters from the commencement of the Government until the time it was reported, 1838. It contains the names, I think, of upwards of three thousand public defaulters. I am not acquainted with the politics of them, but I think I risk nothing in saying, that more than two thirds are, and have been, opposed to the Democratic party. I judge of those I do not know by those I do know. I do not, in general, mean personal acquaintance. I say, as I have done, that defalcations are numerous; they have existed from the commencement of the Government, and they will continue to exist while the Government exists, and while frail man continues to administer it. It is contrary to human nature, and to all human experience, to suppose that this vast political fabric should be managed, in all its various and complicated interests and duties, without abuses; and all that can be done to secure the Government and the people from such abuses and frauds as have been practised, and to provide against subsequent abuses, is to remove the causes that have existed, and to establish such additional checks as will be most likely to secure a faithful and honest administration of the Government in all its parts; at least, so far as human weakness, frailty, and temptation, will permit. I think these will be paramount duties to idle declamation, and that unlimited pouring forth of bitter vituperation and unqualified abuse, for party purposes and President making.

In relation to the defalcation in financial trusts, the causes seem to have had their origin and existence, in part, in the banking system, and the connection of the Government with the banks. It seems to me this must be conceded by all who have honestly investigated the subject. Why, then do those who are opposed to this Administration, denounce it as the cause, in such unqualified terms, of all the abuses now presented by the official reports of defalcations, as well of this Administration and the defaulters under it, as those which have gone before it, for which it is neither morally nor politically responsible? Sir, we can retort I ask, who was it that introduced the banking system into this country in a national sense? Alexander Hamilton. Who was he? One of the leaders of the Federal party. What party is it, and what party has it been, by which it has been kept up? The Federal party. To what party have the principle defaulters belonged? To the Federal party. I say under what Administrations have the greatest amount of defalcations occurred? Not this, nor the one which preceded it. Sir, I propose now to expose the names of some of those who belong to the party who are now crying corruption, corruption, so loud and so