long, in concord with the cry of panic, panic, with which we have been so long grated.—And, sir, if I should open the tombs, break down the ramparts of ancient grave yards, and dig, hyena like, into the grave, and, disrobe the dead, I hope I will find an ample apology in the paramount law of self defence. It was not I who began this exposition.—Should any man's feelings here or elsewhere be hurt, the blame must must not be laid on me, but upon those who have wantonly provoked it.

The first name, then, sir, I will present, is that of one John Adams, once a President of these United States. He, sir, stands upon the records of this Government as a defaulter to the amount of $12,898. The history of this defalcation is understood to be, that a sum of money was appropriated for furnishing the President's house. President Adams drew the cash in advance. He employed this amount in purchasing a splendid carriage and horses, and other personal accommodations. This the accounting officers could now allow. He refused to reimburse the money. This amount, therefore, remains unsettled to this day, and will until the last day.

Edward Randolph, a defaulter for $61,155 07, in 1797. Whose Administration did this happen under? In document of the House 111, of last session, the *collectors'* defaults, at the same period, are shown to, exclusive of interest, half a million of dollars.

Andrew and James Erwin. Document 111 exhibits a defalcation to the modest sum of $80,000. Who has been benefitted by this plunder—any man here to answer? What were the politics of the base speculators?—Whigs.

[Here Mr. Bell, of Tennessee rose, and said, that the Messrs. Erwins were not defaulters. It was a slander promulgated by the Globe paper.]

Mr. Duncan responded, that he did not get his information from the Globe; he obtained it from the records in the archives of the Government; evidence of the highest character, and that which is open to the mind of every one who desires to read. I hope, said Mr. D. it is not true, I would prefer to conceal, at all times, human weakness and depravity, rather than expose, where it may be done without public injury; but I would prefer that such depravity as I am now exposing did not exist. And let me say, once for all, that I know nothing personally of the numerous and wholesale frauds which I am now exposing. I am alike ignorant of the men whom the records show to be the perpetrators. These frauds, with the names of those who committed them, are matters of record, and the facts are spread over the whole country, and known to all who read the journals of Congress, and the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. Consequently, my exposition can neither affect the reputation of those whose names I expose or the cause of justice.

Mr. King, late collector of Bath, Maine, seoms to be a defaulter for the modest sum of $15,000. Perhaps the gentleman now in my eye, [Mr. Evans,] can tell us what that gentleman's politics are, and whether he was not the late Whig candidate for Governor of that State; and whether, with all the corruptions of defalcation in which he is involved, he did not receive the entire *Whig* vote of his State.

So we ride, but again:

Joseph Wingate, late collector at Bath also. I have not before me the amount of his defalcation; but he is a defaulter; and since his defalcation, has been a Whig member of Congress, and most loveingly embraced by the whole party. I ask an examination of the reports. It will be found that the collectors, receivers, and disbursing agents, all, or nearly all, support the views which are now advanced with so much zeal for the entire indemnity of this system of fraud and plunder. Examine No. 191, made to the House of Representatives, February 28, 1838. The loss by banks estimated at about $6,000,000; their nominal debt was nearly double, but partly secured. This amount is exclusive of interest: with interest, it will be near $20,000,000. I refer to the report to the Senate, Feb. 2, 1838, Document No. 158.

The losses prior to General Jackson's administration, by *collectors* and *receivers*, amount to $1,200,000; the nominal sum is nearly double, but part of this sum is secured. It is probable nothing will be lost eventually under Gen. Jackson's administration but by *Littlebury Hawkins*, or under the present Administration but by *Swartwout* and *Price*. There will be other defaulters, but their security will be good for their respective amounts.

The reckless collector at Perth Amboy, has produced some alarm; his defalcation was thirty or fifty dollars. He, so soon as the defalcation was discovered, paid the amount. He was a Democrat. He was misled by his predecessor.

But do we hear any thing from Arnold, the collector of the same place, some years before, under the administration of one John Q. Adams? He is in default for $80,000 not one farthing of which was recovered, yet we hear no Federal murmuring about that defalcation. He was a modera Whig. This was caused by the neglect of the Administration under which the default occurred, according to the charges now preferred; and it was under the Bank Administration. Why this muteness about Arnold's defalcation? All understood.

The loss on merchants' bonds. This loss amounted to $7,000,000, without interest.—See detail of names and dates in report to Senate, 6th July, 1838, doc. No. 503.—There will be found the name of G. W. Brown, of the firm of Thos. Smith and Co. in default for the modest sum of $80,000. I would like to know whether or not he is a violent and noisy Whig in New York Perhaps the Whig gentleman now in my eye [Mr. Curtis] can inform me. And I would inquire of that gentleman, if he did not make the motion in Common Council to dismiss all Democrats in the city from office and public employ, even down to the lamplighters?

Edward Thompson, I think of Philadelphia, whom the record shows to be a defaulter to a considerable amount, say the *reasonable* sum of $100,000, or more Perhaps some of the Whig gentleman from that city can inform us as to his politics. Whig, I presume? Yes, silence gives consent.

All these base frauds and wholesale defalcations occurred under the United States Bank Administration, and before the present Administration. They grew out of the wholesale gambling system establised, maintained and managed by the banks. This system the Democracy of this country have always set their face against. Who are responsible for the losses thus sustained but those who, for party and pecuniary motives, sustain and keep up the fraudulent system that gives birth and support to them?

Collecting officers. Report of January 17, 1838, House of Representatives, document 111, shows names of defaulting collecting officers.

Reports of First and Second Comptrollers of the Treasury, documents Nos. 2, 6, 48, and 186, of the House of Representatives, show defaults of disbursing officers.

In looking through these documents, among many hundred of Whig names I find that of James Monroe, formerly a captain in the army, and is in default $4,115 44. I have understood that this is one of the late Whig members of Congress elect; and I think I have seen him charged with having given $5,000 towards carrying the New York Whig elections. If so, would it not have been more honorable for him to have paid the debt which he owed the nation?

Robert Brunt. The name of this individual stands on record with a defalcation annexed of $78,511. He was a Paymaster General, (Whig)

Samuel Chaplin, late paymaster, defalcation $109,000, (Whig.)

Amos Binney, late navy agent, defalcation $70,562, (Whig.)

Joseph Ruhn. Defaulter for $22,621 55, (Whig.)

Miles King, navy agent, (Whig,) defalcation not exactly known.

But here comes Wm. McMuntry, purser, defalcation $17,991, (Whig.)

Who next? Robert Randolph. Defalcation $25,097.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

To the Senate of the United States:

I lay before Congress several despatches from his Excellency the Governor of Maine, with enclosures, communicating certain proceedings of the Legislature of that State, and a copy of the reply of the Secretary of State, made by my direction, together with a note from H. S. Fox, esq. Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Great Britain, with the answer of the Secretary of State to the same.

It will appear from those documents that a numerous band of lawless and desperate men, chiefly from the adjoining British Provinces, but without the authority or sanction of the Provincial Government, had trespassed upon that portion of the territory in dispute between the United States and Great Britain which is watered by the river Aroostook, and claimed to belong to the State of Maine; and that they had committed extensive depredatious there by cutting and destroying a very large quantity of timber. It will further appear that the Governor of Maine, having been officially apprised of the circumstance, had communicated it to the Legislature, with a recommendation of such provisions, in addition to those already existing by law, as would enable him to arrest the course of said depredations, disperse the trespassers, and secure the timber which they were about carrying away; that in compliance with a resolve of the Legislature, passed in purusance of his recommendation, his Excellency had despatched the land agent of the State, with a force deemed adequate to that purpose, to the alledged depredations, who, after accomplishing a part of his duty, was seized by a band of the trespassers, at a house claimed to be within the jurisdiction of Maine, whither he had repaired for the purpose of meeting and consulting with the land agent of the Province of New Bruuswick, and conveyed as a prisoner to Frederickton, in that Province, together with two other citizens of the State, who were assisting him in the discharge of his duty.

It will also appear that the Governor and Legislature of Maine, satisfied that the trespassers had acted in defiance of the laws of both countries, learning that they were in possession of arms, and anticipating (correctly, as the result has proved) that persons of reckless and desperate character would set at nought the authority of the magistrates, without the aid of a strong force, had authorized the sheriff, and the officer appointed in the place of the land agent, to employ, at the expense of the State, an armed posse, who had proceeded to the scene of these desperations, with a view to the entire dispersion or arrest of the trespassers and the protection of the public property.

In the correspondence between the Governor of Maine and Sir John Harvey, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of New Brunswick, which has grown out of these occurrences, and is likewise herewith communicated, the former is requested to recall the armed party advanced into the disputed territory for the arrest of trespassers, and is informed that a strong body of British troops is to be held in readiness to support and protect the authority and subjects of Great Britain in said territory. In answer to that request the Provincial Governor is informed of the determination of the State of Maine to support the land agent and his party, in the performance of their duty, and the same determination, for the execution of which provision is made by a resolution of the State Legislature, is communicated by the Governor to the General Government.

The Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, in calling upon the Governor of Maine for the recall of the land agent and his party from the disputed territory, and the British Minister in making a similar demand upon the Government of the United States, proceed upon the assumption that an agreement exists between the two nations conceding to Great Britain, until the final settlement of the boundary question, exclusive possession of, and jurisdiction over, the territory in dispute. The important bearing which such an agreement, if it existed, would have upon the condition and interest of the parties, and the influence it might have upon the adjustment of the dispute, are too obvious to allow the error upon which this assumption seems to rest to pass for a moment without correction. The answer of the Secretary of State to Mr. Fox's note, will show the ground taken by the Government of the United States upon this point. It is believed that all the correspondence which has passed between the two Governments upon this subject has already been communicated to Congress, and is now on their files An abstract of it, however, hastily prepared, accompanies this communication. It is possible that in thus abridging a voluminous correspondence, commencing in 1825 and continuing to a very recent period, a portion may have been accidentally overlooked; but it is believed that nothtng has taken place which would materially change the aspect of the question as therein presented. Instead of sustaining the assumption of the British functionaries that correspondence disproves the existence of any such agreement. It shows that the two Governments have differed not only in regard to the main question of title to the territory in dispute, but with reference also to the right of jurisdiction, and the fact of the actual exercise of it in different portions thereof. Always aiming at an amicable adjustment of the dispute, both parties have entertained and repeatedly urged upon each other a desire, that each should exercise its rights, whatever it considered them to be, in such a manner as to avoid collision, and allay, to the greatest practical extent, the excitement likely to grow out of the controversy. It was in pursuance of such an understanding that Maine and Massachusetts upon the remonstrance of Great Britain, desisted from making sales of lands, and the General Government from the construction of a projected military road in a portion of the territory of which they claimed to have enjoyed the exclusive possession; and that Great Britain, on her part, in deference to a similar remonstrance from the United States, suspended the issue of licenses to cut timber in the territory in controversy, and also the survey and location of a railroad through a section of country over which she also claimed to have exercised exclusive jurisdiction.

The State of Maine had a right to arrest the depredations complained of; it belonged to her to judge of the exigency of the occasion calling for her interference; and it is presumed that had the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick been correctly advised of the nature of the proceedings of the State of Maine, he would not have regarded the transaction as requiring, on his part, any resort to force. Each party claiming a right to the territory, and hence to the exclusive jurisdiction over it, it is manifest that, to prevent the destruction of the timber by trespassers, acting against the authority of both, and at the same time avoid forcible collision between the contiguous Governments during the pendency of negotiations concerning the title, resort must be had to the mutual exercise of jurisdiction in such extreme cases, or to an amicable and temporary arrangement as to the limits within which it should be exercised by each party. The understanding supposed to exist between the United States and Great Britain has been found heretofore sufficient for that purpose, and I believe will prove so hereafter, if the parties on the frontier, directly interested in the question, are respectively governed by a just spirit of conciliation and forbearance. If it shall be found, as there is now reason to apprehend, that there is, in the modes of constructing that understanding by the two Governments, a difference not to be reconciled, I shall not hesitate to propose to her Britannic Majesty's Government a distinct arrangement for the temporary and mutual exercise of jurisdiction, by means of which similar difficulties may in future be prevented.

But between an effort on the part of Maine to preserve the property in dispute from destruction by intruders, and a military occupation by that State of the territory, with a view to hold it by force, while the settlement is a subject of negotiation between the two Governments, there is an essential difference, as well in respect to the position of the State, as to the duties of the General Government. In a letter addressed by the Secretary of State to the Governor of Maine, on the first of March last, giving a detailed statement of the steps which had been taken by the Federal Government to bring the controversy to a termination, and designed to apprise the governor of that State of the views of the Federal Executive, in respect to the future, it was stated, that while the obligations of the Federal Government to do all in its power to effect the settlement of the boundary question were fully recognised, it had, in the event of being unable to do so specifically, by mutual consent, no other means to accomplish that object amicably, than by another arbitration, or by a commission with an empire in the nature of an arbitration; and that in the event of all other measures failing, the President would feel it his duty to submit another proposition to the Government of Great Britain, to refer the decision of the question to a third power. These are still my views upon the subject, and until this step shall have been taken, I cannot think it proper to invoke the attention of Congress to other than amicable means for the settlement of the controversy, or to cause the military power of the Federal Government to be brought in aid of the State of Maine, in any attempt to affect that object by a resort to force.

On the other hand, if the authorities of New Brunswick should attempt to enforce the claim of exclusive jurisdiction set up by them, by means of a military occupation on their part of the disputed territory, I shall feel myself bound to consider the contingency provided by the Constitution as having occurred, on the happening of which a State has the right to call for the aid of the Federal Government to repel invasion.

I have expressed to the British Minister near this Government a confident expectation that the agents of the State of Maine, who have been arrested under an obvious misapprehension of the object of their mission, will be promptly released; and to the Governor of Maine that a similar course will be pursued in regard to the agents of the Province of New Brunswick. I have also recommended that any militia that may have been brought together by the State of Maine, from an apprehension of a colission with the Government or people of the British Province, will be voluntarily and peaceably disbanded.

I cannot allow myself to doubt that the results anticipated from these representations will be seasonably realized. The parties more immediately interested cannot but perceive that an appeal to arms, under existing circumstances, will not only prove fatal to their present interests, but would postpone, if not defeat, the attainment of the main objects which they have in view. The very incidents which have recently occurred will necessarily awaken the Governments to the importance of promptly adjusting a dispute, by which it is now made manifest that the peace of the two nations is daily and imminently endangered. This expectation is further warranted by the general forbearance which has hitherto characterized the conduct of the Government and people on both sides of the line. In the uniform patriotism of Maine, her attachment to the Union, her respect for the wishes of the people of her sister States, of whose interest in her welfare she cannot be unconscious, and, in the solicitude felt by the country at large for the preservation of peace with our neighbors, we have a strong guarantee that she will not disregard the request that has been made of her.

As, however, the session of Congress is about to terminate, and the agency of the Executive may become necessary during the recess, it is important that the attention of the Legislature should be drawn to the consideration of such measures as may be calculated to obviate the necessity of a call for an extra session. With that view, I have thought it my duty to lay the whole matter before you, and to invite such action thereon as you may think the occasion requires.

M. VAN BUREN.

WASHINGTON, 26th Feb. 1839.

From the Easton Whig

Senator Boon fully exposed. Evidence produced that can neither "be evaded nor denied."

We received last night several certificates from gentlemen of Caroline County relative to *pledges* made by Senator Boon; of which he has been fully charged through the columns of this paper, and at which time we also asserted our ability to sustain the charges we prefered by *sworn evidence*. We have only time to present the subjoined two certificates, with but little room for comment.—That Mr. Boon did unequivocally *pledge himself* to members of the Van Buren party in Caroline, no candid man will now, we presume, pretend to deny. Indeed it appears as additional light comes in upon us, Mr. Boon's hypocrisy and fraud are abhorrently greater than we at first supposed. We shall continue the subject next week, and for the present leave the certificates to speak for themselves.

DENTON, March 2d, 1839.

George W. Sherwood, Esq.

Sir,—You will please give the following certificate a place in your paper.

I do hereby certify that about a week before the October election in 1838, John Boon Esquire, came down to Denton Bridge, and called me from on board a vessel to him, (then in his carriage,) and said he had been informed, that I would not use my influence to secure his election. Sir, said I, you have been informed correctly. I look upon you and Mr. Burchenal alike; you both have been violent opposers of my party, and I care not which is elected, for I can see nothing the Van Buren party can gain by electing you. I then asked him which party he considered strongest in the county? he replied the whigs about 30 votes. I then asked him how many Whig votes he expected to get; he said about 30; then I said, you must get every Van Buren vote to elect you. This he acknowledged. Sir, said I, this you cannot do, their are a great many who will not support you, unless you come out in plain terms, and let the party know what they are to gain by electing you. You know Sir, we have not been friendly for years past, but that would make no difference with me, if I could believe the party could gain by electing you. I also said, your public address is not a sufficient pledge for our party, as your Whig friends say you are as good a Whig as you ever were, and under those circumstances you cannot possibly get the vote of this District by many votes. He then replied, what do you want me to do Sir? If elected, I remarked it must be by the Van Buren party, as you admit; then Sir, in that event we wish you to go for us *in all measures of importance*; *United States Senator was also mentioned*; Mr. B. said will you keep secret what I say to you; for should my Whig friends find it out it will defeat my election; I said I would; then he said if I am elected, *I will go with your party in all important measures*, coming before me as a Senator.—On my return from the bridge to town I saw Mr. Baily, and related to him what had passed between Mr. Boon and myself, the possability of his denying what had passed in case he should be elected, and that the matter would stand on a point of veracity between Mr. Boon and myself, and I requested Mr. Baily that he would see Mr. Boon before the election, and inform him what I had related to him, (Baily) and see what would be his reply; and also tell him, I should say nothing to any other person until the election was over, and for the event of that interview I refer to the certificate of Mr. Baily.

Very respectfully,

JAS. SANGSTON.

Sworn to before me

HUGH TAYLOR.

March 4, 1839.

P. S. My party knew I was opposed to Mr. Boon until a few days before the election, and until the interview alluded to above. when he Mr. Boon promised all I wished or required at his hands. J. S.

I do hereby certify that on Tuesday preceding the election on Wednesday in October 1838, I met with John Boon Esq., then a candidate for State Senator; and that the following conversation passed between him and myself. I met Mr. Boon near my door, and said to him, I am very glad you and Mr. Jas. Sangston have had another interview, you have satisfied him perfectly, with regard to your course if elected. There has been a great change in Mr. S's. course since that time, he is now doing all he can for your election; he told me confidentially, what had passed between you and himself, and that you had *promised*, if elected, TO GO FOR ALL THE MEASURES OF THE PARTY, OF ANY IMPORTANCE, coming before you as Senator. This will satisfy those that were in doubt upon this matter, and there is nothing to fear for your election. I think we will be able to get nearly all our party to vote for you. His reply was; yes sir, I *did say so*, to Mr. Sangston, but if it gets to the other party my election is lost. I replied, what has passed is to go no further, by Mr. S's. request.—Then he said I have thrown myself on your party, and if you do not sustain me my election is lost; sir, said I, there is nothing to dread now from the support of our party. Do not let the Whig party hear what has passed; for God's sake do not sacrifice me, were is parting words.

W. BAILEY.

Sworn to before me

HUGH TAYLOR.

March 4, 1839.

Denton, Caroline county, Md.

General Scott, accompanied by Major Ripley and captains Anderson and Keyes, reached Boston on Saturday morning, the 2nd inst. on his way to the North Eastern Frontier.—We learn from the Boston Evening Gazette that Gen. S. was introduced to Governor Everett in the Council Chamber, who addressed him substantially as follows:

GENERAL,

I take great pleasure in presenting you to the members of the Executive of Massachusetts. I need not say that you are already well known to them by reputation. They are familiar with your fame, as it is recorded on some of the most arduous and honorable fields of the country's struggles. We rejoice in meeting you on this occason, charged as you are with a most momentous mission, by the President of the United States. We are sure you are entrusted with a duty most grateful to your feelings—that of averting an appeal to arms. We place unlimited reliance on your spirit, energy, and discretion. Should you unhappily fail in your efforts, under the instructions of the President to restore harmony, we know that you go equally prepared for a still more responsible duty. Should that event unhappily occur, I beg you to depend on the firm support of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The answer of the General was happy and appropriate—he concluded by saying that the Executive of the United States had full reliance upon the patriotism and public spirit of Massachusetts, in any emergency which might arise.—*Baltimore American.*

CONGRESSIONAL

From the Baltimore American.

WASHINGTON, March 2, 1839.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Friday Night's Proceedings.

The bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorising the raising of 16 companies of infantry, &c. was debated in Committee of the Whole, until twelve o'clock.

Mr. Evans, of Me. advocated the bill in a speech of great power and eloquence.

Mr. Pickins of S. C zealously opposed it, and moved the striking out of the second section, proposing the increase of the army.

Mr. Saltonstall of Mass, also opposed the bill as being a war measure.

Mr Naylor of Pa. advocated the passage and replied with great earnestness to Mr. Pickins, who, he said, though so much in favor of vindicating the honor of the country, was nevertheless opposed to procuring the means whereby the honor of the Nation was to be protected.

Mr. Hoffman, of N. Y. one of the Committee of Foreign Relations, advocated the passage of the bill as a pacific measure. War was a contingent measure only, and the bill would prevent a war.

The bill was then left in Committee of the whole, and made the order of the day for this day at 11 A. M.

Saturday Morning.

The debate on the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs was commenced this morning by Mr. Saltonstall, of Mass. who made an explanation and reply to Mr. Evans.

Mr. Cushing, of Mass. followed in a very able speech, condemning the conduct of Sir John Harvey in regard to the Maine controversy.

Mr. Johnson moved an amendment, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a site and to order the erection of a National Armory for the manufacture of Cannon. Mr. Johnson briefly advocated the amendment which was lost by a large vote.

Mr Wise then moved that the second section of the bill be stricken out. Tellers were appointed and the second section of the bill was stricken out, ayes 95, nays 78.

Mr. McKay, of N. C. then offered an amendment authorising the President to call out fifty thousand volunteer militia in case of invasion.

The Committee then decided to adopt the amendment by a vote of 95 to 64, and voted ten millions of dollars to meet the expenses of defence.

Mr. Fillmore offered an amendment for the defence of the country borbering on the Lakes, by placing armed steamboats upon them. This amendment was sustained by a majority of twenty.

After several amendments had been adopted, and a large number rejected, the Committee rose and reported the bill to the House.

The yeas and nays were ordered upon the motion to strike out the second section of the bill as reported to the House by the Committee of Foreign Affairs. The vote was ayes 134—nays 57.

The House then sustained the amendment authorising the President to raise $10,000,000, by loan, to carry out the provisions of the bill.

The yeas and nays were then ordered upon the final passage of the bill. The vote was—ayes 201—noes 6.

The subject was then disposed of, and the bill was passed finally unanimously.

UNITED STATES SENATE.

Friday Night's Proceedings.

MAINE BORDER.

The resolutions from the Committee on Foreign Affairs were unanimously adopted, after the last clause of the fourth resolution had been so modified as to be stricken out & a cluse inserted that the General Government would vindicate the rights of Maine in case Great Britain persisted in enforcing the claim of exclusive jurisdiction over the disputed territory.

After Mr. Clay closed his remarks, the debate was continued by Messrs. Webster, Southard, Davis, Buchanan, Rives, Williams of Me. Allen, Walker, Benton, Niles, and Brown. Mr. Rives favored the resolutions as reported.

So also Mr. Southard, who took the same view of the question as taken by Mr Clay.

Messrs Webster, Davis, Walker and Benton were for having the General Government taking a higher and more decisive stand.