EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

"THE PRICE OF LIBERTY IS PERPETUAL VIGILANCE."

NEW SERIES. EASTON, MARYLAND, TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1839. VOL. VI-NO 9

THE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE
Is edited and published every
TUESDAY MORNING,
BY
GEO. W. SHERWOOD,
(PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.)

TERMS:—Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance.
No subscription will be received for less than six months, nor discontinued until all arrearages are settled, without the approbation of the publisher
Advertisements not exceeding a square, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for very subsequent insertion—larger advertisements in proportion.
☞ All communications to insure attention should be *post paid*

MISCELLANEOUS.

Written for the Whig.

I never can forget thee love
Though fate our fortunes sever,
I never can forget thee love
Though absent from thee ever.

I never can forget the tear
That like a dew-drop bright,
Coursed down thy blushing cheek my love
Upon that parting night.

Upon thy sad yet lovely face
The moonbeams softly shone,
And caused within thy beating heart
A pain not thine alone.

But mem'ry ever bright does bring
That parting hour to mind,
While on the world I look in vain—
In vain thy like to find. * * *
Feb. 1839.

[For the Eastern Shore Whig.]

SELECTIONS FROM ANCIENT HISTORY.

ROME.—During the first ages of the Republic the Romans lived in a total neglect of all the elegant improvements of life. War, politics, and agriculture were the only arts they studied, because they were the only arts esteemed. Nor was it until the downfall of Carthage that they began to cultivate the arts. The conquests of Greece and Asia put them in possession of every thing most rare, and the refinements of the earth. Eloquence they had always cultivated.

Agriculture engaged the attention of the first magistrates and the generals of the armies of Rome, who cultivated their fields and threshed their grain with those arms which vanquished the enemy and supported the State. Quintus Cincinnatus was found working in the field by those who came to salute him Dictator. The elder Cato betook himself to Agriculture, and has left some works upon the subject. He not only worked with his slaves, but ate of the same bread with them, and drank of the same wine. Scipio Africans, after having defeated in Spain four of the greatest Carthagenian generals, after having conquered Hannibal himself, and rendered Carthage tributary to Rome, took up his spade, and became a husbandman. All the Romans of easy circumstances, were laborers, and all the laborers were soldiers. Such were the Romans before they became corrupted by riches and luxury.—The love of labour, however, became a rare occurrence in succeeding ages. Riches became necessary to pave the way to power and glory, and luxury, avarice and pride, were the natural offspring of such a consequence.

In the glorious days of the Republic the Romans prepared their meals with care but without art or delicacy. But the Asiatic luxury making its way to Rome, very soon infected their tables. Every delicacy and profusion were carried to the greatest excess. The cook, anciently the lowest of all the slaves became the most important, and a contemptible employment became an important art.

The Romans had no other money but brass till the war with Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, five years before the Carthagenian war, when silver was first coined. The *sestertius* was the smallest silver coin, equal to one penny and three farthings English. The *denarius* was the cheif silver coin among the Romans, value seven pence three farthings. The *talent* an value was 187 pounds ten shillings.

From the Church of England Magazine.

THE JEW AND HIS DAUGHTER.

As I was going through the western part of Virginia, (says an American writer,) an old clergyman gave me a short account of an old Jew which greatly delighted me. He had only lately become acquainted with him. He was preaching to his people, when he saw a man enter, having every mark of a Jew in his face. He was well dressed, and his looks seemed to tell that he had been in great sorrow. He took his seat, and listened in a devout manner, while a tear was often seen to wet his manly cheek. After the service, the clergyman went up to him and said, "Sir, do I not address myself to one of the children of Abraham?" "You do, he replied." "But how is it that I meet a Jew in a Christian Church?" The substance of this account was as follows: —He had been well educated, had come from London, and with his books, his riches, and a lovely daughter of seventeen, had found a charming retreat on the fruitless banks of Ohio. He had buried his wife before he left Europe, and he knew no pleasure but the company of his beloved child. She was indeed worthy of a parent's love. Her mind was well informed, her disposition amiable; she could read and speak with ease various languages, and her manners pleased all who saw her. No wonder then, that a doating father whose head had now become sprinkled with grev, should place his whole affections on this lovely child. Being a strict Jew, he brought her up in the strictest principles of his religion.

It was not long ago that his daughter was taken sick. The rose faded from her cheek; her eye lost its fire, her strength decayed; and it was soon too cer ain that death was creeping upon her frame—The father hong over her bed with a heart ready to burst with anguish. He often tried to talk with her, but could seldom speak except by the language of his tears. He spared no expense or trouble in getting her medical aid, but no medical skill could extract the arrow of death now fixed in her breast.—The father was walking in a wood near his house, when he was sent for by the dying daughter. With a heavy heart he entered the door of the chamber. He was now to take the last farewell of his child, and his religion gave him but feeble hope of meeting her hereafter.

The child grasped the hand of her parent with a death cold hand. "My father do you love me?"—"My child you know I love you; that you are more dear to me than the world beside." "But my father, do you love me?" "Why my child, will you give me pain? Have I never give you any proof of my love?" "But my dearest father, do you love me?" The father could not answer. The child added, "I know, my dearest father you have ever loved me; you have been the kindest of parents, and I tenderly love you:—will you grant me one request? Oh, my father, it is the dying request of your daughter; will you grant it?" "My dearest child, ask what you will—though it take every farthing of my property; whatever it may be it thall be granted, I will grant it." "My dear father, *I beg you never again to speak against Jesus of Nazareth.* The farther was dumb with surprise. "I know," added the dying girl, "I know but little about this Jesus, for I was *never* taught—but I know that he is a SAVIOUR, for he has made himself known to me since I have been sick, even for the salvation of my soul. I believe he will save me—though I have never before loved him I feel that I am going to him. And now, my dear father, do not deny me, I beg that you will never speak against Jesus of Nazareth, I will entreat you to obtain a Testament, that will teach you to pray that you may know him; so that when I am no more, you may bestow upon him that love which was formerly bestowed upon me."

The labor of speaking here overcame her feeble body. She stopped, and the father's heart was too full even for a tear. He left the room in great horror of mind and ere he could recover his spirit, the soul of his daughter had taken its flight, as I trust, to that Saviour whom she loved and honored.

The first thing he did, after he had buried his child, was to procure a New Testament. This he read, and taught by the Spirit from above, is now numbered among the meek and happy followers of Christ.

POLITICAL.

[FROM THE GLOBE]

On the 16th and 17th January last, I made some remarks in the House of Representatives on the resolution to appoint a committee to inquire into the defalcations of Samuel Swartwout, which remarks were soon after published in the Globe, and have since been published in a pamphlet form. Mr. Stanly, of North Carolina, followed me in reply. At the commencement of his remarks, he insinuated that I was an Abolitionist. I promptly pronounced the insinuation a base falsehood, and a foul detraction, whether it dwelt upon the lips of the unprincipled calumniator, or floated on the breeze in the corrupt, poisonous and slanderous Federal sheets of the day. My intention at the time was to insult the member. So he understood me. So all who heard me understood me. My meaning was that the *member* was a base liar and a foul calumniator; and the only reason that he was *indirectly* thus denounced, was because the rules of the House prohibited me from doing it *directly*, without laying himself hable to its censure. All this, too, was well understood at the time; and for this intended and well understood insult, I held myself in readiness to give the member any satisfaction which he might have the moral courage to seek. But no disposition to seek for redress was manifested within the time I had a right to expect it, or within the time it might be expected from a man who had any regard for his honor or reputation. So I was disposed to let the member go for what I believe him to be, a mean pottoon and a base liar; and which I believe he may at any time, and in any place, be pronounced with impunity.

Some ten or twelve days after making the remarks to which I allude, I saw a communication in the National Intelligencer, occupying the space of four or five columns of that paper, purporting to be "the reply of Mr Stanley, of North Carolina, to Dr. Duncan." I was surprised to see a reply of such length.—I was not present all the time the member was speaking. I was present, as I have stated, when he commenced. I was present when he finished, and his last remark was, "I have detained the House not more than fifteen minutes." I thought he was correct as to the time he occupied the floor—(a short time in which to make a speech occupying four and a half columns of one of the largest newspaper sheets.)

Leave is sometimes asked of the House to write out a speech which there may not be time to make, and the privilege is generally granted. This is an accommodation to the House, and to the country, whose business is permitted to progress. But, in all cases of this kind, leave of the House ought to be obtained and a notice of the fact ought to accompany the written speech. It is mean & basely dishonorable, and it is a falsehood and a fraud practised upon the community, to promulgate a speech purporting to have been delivered on the floor of Congress which never was there spoken, on any other conditions than by the leave and with the notice which I have named.

I say that the speech published in the National Intelligencer of the 4th ultimo, purporting to be "the remarks of Mr. Stanley, in reply to Dr. Duncan." never was delivered in the House of Representatives nor any other place, except through the polluted columns of the corrupt, Bank bought, servile and degraded sheet, through which it makes its appearance; therefore, its very caption or title contains a base falsehood, and a mean attempt at fraud and imposition upon the public. Its whole body is a tissue of misrepresentations, unmanly insinuations, and low vulgarity, worthy of the man that can be charged with base falsehood and foul detraction with impunity. In ordar to know that I could not be mistaken as to the *time* the member occupied in his attempt to reply to me, and to ascertain some other facts, of which I will soon speak, I addressed the following notes, to the gentlemen whose names are prefixed, to which I received the subjoined answers:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 9, 1839.

SIR: If you were present on the 17th January, 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 (Stanly) 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 Representatives 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. Stanly in making his reply, but my impression is it did not exceed fifteen or twenty minutes.

In the course of Mr. Stanly's remarks, I understood him to make allusions to a letter which he alledged 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. Stanly by some gentlemen who sat near me, and who called my attention to the fact, that Mr. Slade was prompting Mr. Stanly, 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. Stanly received the letter above referred to.

I am, sir, respectfully yours, &c.

H. L. TURNEY.

Hon. A. DUNCAN.

To a similar letter addressed to the Hon. Mr. Bynum, he replies:—

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 thing 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Feb. 12, 1839.

Sir: In reply to the interrogatories contained in your communication of the 9th inst. I will state that I was in the House at the time referred to, and heard the remarks both of Mr. Stanly and yourself. The time occupied by Mr. S. in his reply to you did not, to the best of my recollection, exceed fifteen minutes.

Very respectfully,

ELY MOORE.

Hon. A. DUNCAN.

I think *I* am sustained in the fact which *I* have asserted, viz. that "the speech of Mr. Stanly of North Carolina, 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 minutes 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 responsibility 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 re-election. 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 exposition. 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 it it be at any considerable distance; hardly the ninth part of a man; a thing now out of time and out of place; 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 exposing 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 anti-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 hypocrisy! 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 prompting 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 Whigery, 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 admission and acknowledgement into which the member from North Carolina was either tricked or coaxed by party discipline, 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 paragraph:

"Mr. Slade introduced the following resolution:

"Whereas there exists, and is carried on between certain ports in the District of Columbia and ports of the United States, and under the protection 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,' and 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 arose and 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 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 slaveholding 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 member 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 Hampshire.

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 Representatives during Tuesday and Wednesday last.

Oblige me by publishing this note.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWARD STANLY.

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 interrogatories 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 occasion, 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 best 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 friend to human liberty, and would be unworthy the proud name of an American.

My objections to modern Abolitionists, 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 adjournament 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 (Mr. 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, & of right ought to be, the judges of what they shall petition Congress 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 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 perpetuity 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 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 distrub 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 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!

I conclude by saying, that if the speech in the Intelligencer, which purports to be "the reply of Mr. Stanly of North Carolina to Dr. Duncan," had been delivered, and had the member suspended the previous question which he held and which he refused to suspend this communication would have appeared in the form of a reply, which would have been made to all he really did say; but as it was I thought it due to myself, to those who may read this paper, and to the cause of truth and justice, to make the above expose.

Further this deponent saith not.

A. DUNCAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
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 institutions and prospects of those countries and States where it exists. I also, in the same letter, deprecate 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 intended 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, 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 known, 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 fragments have been exhibited, you were 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Febuary 18, 1839.

SIR: In the remarks which I made in the House of Representatives on the 17th January, 1839, on the resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the defalcations of Samuel Swartwout, I exposed the names of several Government defaulters, & the several amounts for which they were in default, and the offices which they held under which the defalcations occurred. In my expositions I was governed by the official reports and records of the different Government Departments. Among them I found the name of Robert B. Randolph, acting purser in the navy, reported to be a defaulter to the amount of $25,000, or upwards. Since the publication of the remarks above referred to, I have seen a communication addressed to me through the Alexandria Gazette, (a paper published in the District of Columbia,) signed Robert B. Randolph, denying that he is a public defaulter, as he has vouchers to show, &c.

I hope the statement of Mr. Randolph is true. It will give me great uneasiness, if I have done him injustice. I have not the slightest acquaintance with Mr. Randolph, nor have I any practical knowledge of his defalcation whatever. If I have done him injustice in the exposition I have made, it will give me great pleasure to acknowledge my error in as public a manner as I have made the exposition. Will you have the goodness to inform me, without delay, what the relations of Mr. Randolph are with the Government in reference to the defalcations reported by your Department?

Respectfully,
(Signed) A. DUNCAN.

To the Fourth Auditor.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, FOURTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE,
February 19, 1839.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, inquiring "what the relations of Mr. Robert B. Randolph are with the Government, in reference to the defalcations reported by the Treasury Department," and to state, in reply, that the account of Mr. Randolph, as acting purser of the frigate Constitution, was settled and closed in this office, in the month of October, 1828; that