

# THE RALEIGH TIMES.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY CH. C. RABOTEAU,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS: \$2 50 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE, OR  
\$3 00 IF PAYMENT IS DELAYED SIX MONTHS.

VOL. III.

RALEIGH, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1850.

NO. 34

## TERMS.

For every Square line, or less, One Dollar for the first, and Twenty-five Cents for each subsequent insertion. Three Dollars will be charged, if payment be delayed six months. Those Terms will be invariably adhered to.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

For every Square line, or less, One Dollar for the first, and Twenty-five Cents for each subsequent insertion. Three Dollars will be charged, if payment be delayed six months. Those Terms will be invariably adhered to.

## NOT THERE.

It has been remarked by the Fayetteville Observer, that what is not in the resolutions of the late Democratic Convention at Raleigh, is equally worthy of remark with what is in them. There is not the most remote allusion to the Wilcox Provision in them! This is accounted for by the fact that David S. Reid, their nominee for Governor, not only believes the Wilcox Provision constitutional, but actually voted for it in the Oregon bill, when he was in Congress, on the 18th of January 1847.

What Mr. Reid voted for, President Polk approved, protesting against its necessity but not, of course, against its constitutionality. Mr. Reid and President Polk both doubtless acted conscientiously; but the democratic fire-eaters who have taken Southern Rights specially in charge profess abhorrence of all such concessions. We suppose that in all their denunciations they have a mental reservation in favor of any Democratic who seems likely to serve a present turn for them—no matter what his opinions or acts may have been.

It had been the Whig candidate who had voted for the Provision, such epithets as "traitor," "abandoner," "indecisive," "would have been shown over his head by the Democratic scribblers and orators with a perfect aim.

Greensboro' Pat.

**SACRIFICING AND CHRISTENING OF FREE SUFFRAGE.**  
We attended the very interesting ceremony of christening the little two year old bantling, Free Suffrage, in Raleigh, on the 14th June. Bishop Saunders, of the Democratic Society, was present, accompanied by elders Biggs, Caldwell, Strange, McRae, and other distinguished laymen. The ceremony was performed by Deacon McRae, of Raleigh, and in laying his hands upon the head of D. S. Reid and W. W. Holden, he pronounced in the most solemn manner, that "David S. Reid and W. W. Holden are the fathers and founders of Free Suffrage, having first got up and propagated it in N. C." The Deacon of course stands as sponsor to his young Carolina! Who has any thing to say of its origin now? Or what will Mr. Cobb, of Ga., say to this? We guess.

It may be necessary to remark that this young man had well nigh lost its life in our last Legislature by the hands of its professional friends, but by good nursing it has been reinstated into the Democratic family and christened.

Asheville Messenger.

The following letter from Mr. Fillmore in reply to an invitation to be present at a Sons of Temperance celebration of the Fourth of July, at Buffalo will be read with interest:

WASHINGTON, June 18th.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your kind invitation to attend a "Union Celebration" in the city of Buffalo, of the approaching anniversary of our National Independence. Nothing could give me more pleasure than to be permitted to mingle with my fellow-citizens on that joyous occasion. Judging from the favorable reports which I have recently heard of the progress of the cause of Temperance in Buffalo, I infer that this "Union Celebration" implies a union of Patriotism and Temperance—of cool heads and warm hearts—and such a union is greatly desired at this time, to save the Union to which we are all so devotedly attached. I do not, however, anticipate that it will be in my power to accept your flattering invitation, as my official duties will in all probability require my presence here.

I trust, however, that notwithstanding the present painful aspect of our political affairs, and the jarring discord of sectional feeling, that the wisdom and conciliation of the present generation are equal to the preservation of the glorious Constitution, unimpaired, which they have received as the greatest blessing from their ancestors, and that this birthday of our nation shall ever find us "one and inseparable."

Truly yours, WILLARD FILLMORE.

Orson Phelps and others, Com. of Arrangements.

**We were a Fluffy Wastrel.**—We were a fluffy wastrel, on the night when first we met—with a famous pair of whiskers, and imperial of jet—His air had all the haughtiness, his voice the many tone, of a gentleman of eighty thousand dollars all his own. I saw him but a moment, and he thinks I see him now, with a very fluffy waistcoat, and a beaver on his brow, and once again I saw that brow—no hat Bobee was there, but a slouching hat on his head, and that matter was his hair. He wore a brick within that hat, the change was all complete, and he was flanked by constables, who marched him up the street. I saw him but a moment, yet he thinks I see him now, clasped by those worthy officers with kicking up a row.

The following unique toast was drunk at a 4th of July celebration in South Carolina by G. Kimrod:

"Peace and plenty;  
"Core in the pig-stick and money in the pocket,  
"Bury in the cradle and pretty wife to rock it;  
"Coffee in the closet and Sugar in the barrel;  
"Sifters round the fire-side and folks that never quarrel."

**Good.**—In Lowell, Ill., a happy couple were recently married, and in the evening the relatives of the neighborhood collected and celebrated the party, firing guns, pistols, and making all manner of hideous sounds; at length, cake was handed round to the guests, each cake containing a portion of liquor. The consequence was that the music of the wedding and the noise of the party were exchanged for a low, hoarse, and noisy roar, and the bride and groom were obliged to leave the party.

## SPEECH OF MR. E. STANLY, OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1850.

The Report of the Select Committee, made on the Letter of the Secretary of War, concerning the payment of the Galphin Claim, being under consideration.

Mr. Stanly said:

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the House refused to lay on the table the report of the Galphin claim. I voted in a small minority to dispose of this matter by laying it on the table, and I did so with the view of enabling the House to proceed with the public business.

The appropriation bills, which are indispensable for the support of the Government, are not yet acted on. California is still cruelly kept out of the Union. Thousands of laboring men in our country are begging us to protect them from the effects of the British tariff of 1816—a tariff which we are informed gives great satisfaction to England. Hundreds of honest claimants are supplicating us to act upon bills reported for their relief. All these matters are demanding our attention, while we are wasting our time in fruitless efforts to make, or to prevent making, party capital out of the Galphin report. Let the Government stand still—let California wait—let the British lion complacently smile at the folly of the Americans, who, boasting of their freedom, are making themselves as dependent on England as if we were still her colonies—let honest creditors suffer, the Galphin claim alone demands all our patriotic consideration. If gentlemen on the other side of this Hall, who have elected their Speaker and their Clerk, and have control here, will insist in thus spending time, it is becoming and proper that we look into other matters of improper conduct among their friends.

But first, a few words on the Galphin claim. I regret, as every gentleman in the country must, that the Secretary of War continued to act as an agent of the claim while he held his place in the Cabinet. It is a matter of taste and of delicacy, about which we may differ, as it seems to me to differ. But I think there is an opinion nearly unanimous that it was not becoming in Mr. Crawford to act as an agent of this claim while he was in the Cabinet. As a member of a party, his conduct was inadvisable; if not unbecoming, towards the other members of the Cabinet. But no honorable man has imputed anything dishonorable to Mr. Crawford. His conduct has been unfortunate and unwise, but his integrity stands fair and unimpeached.

The Whig party are no more to blame for this act of his, than the Democratic party is for Mr. Van Buren's bad conduct, or for the indecency or impropriety which marked the conduct of General Cass, in obtaining sixty-eight thousand dollars for extra allowances, which Congress never authorized to be paid, nor for his forming a company while in the Cabinet, to speculate in public lands. Neither the conduct of Mr. Crawford nor of General Cass has been criminal. Both, in my judgment, have been unjustifiable. As Secretary of War, General Cass would have advantages which citizens of the country could not have. He had opportunities of enabling his company to monopolize the choice tracts of land, to know when they would be in market, and then to raise the price and sell them to settlers who were compelled to purchase. The Whig party have not endorsed, and never will endorse or sanction, Mr. Crawford's conduct. The Democratic party made General Cass their standard bearer, unappointed and unhealed, with all these sins on his head. When they shout "Galphin, Galphin," we are not justified in retorting, "Sixty-eight thousand dollars extra allowances—speculations in public lands? I do not intend to assail General Cass personally. I only refer to well-known facts. No Whig, who has any self-respect, or any regard for public opinion, will violate all the decencies of life by uttering calumnies in relation to this gentleman. And he who imputes dishonesty to either Mr. Crawford or Mr. Cass, merits and will receive the contempt of all fair-minded men. They will both comfort themselves with the reflection—

"'Tis but the fate of place, and the rough brake  
That virtue must go through."

It is only to be regretted that they did not further reflect, that

"Things done well,  
And with a care, exempt themselves from fear;  
Things done without example, in their issue  
Are to be feared."

They are to be blamed for a bad example; they forget that "all things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient."

A few words more on the Galphin claim.

The act for the relief of Galphin is in the following words:

"Be it enacted, etc. etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and required to examine and adjust the claim of the late George Galphin, under the treaty made by the Governor of Georgia with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, in the year 1773, and to pay the amount which may be found due to Milledge Galphin, executor of the said George Galphin, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Approved, August 14, 1818.  
The wrong in this case, if any wrong has been done, was in passing this act. I do not understand it to be denied that George Galphin had a claim. It is admitted that under the treaty referred to, the claim of Galphin was admitted to be true. Then the act of Congress authorized and required the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the claim under the treaty made by the Governor of Georgia, with the Creek and Cherokee Indians in 1773, and to pay the amount which may be found due. The Secretaries who paid the principal and interest, (Mr. Walker and Mr. Meredith) were not to be blamed for obeying an act of Congress. Congress is to blame, and the Secretaries, if blame rests anywhere. And let it not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker,

that Mr. Polk approved this bill; he seems to have been informed of the merits of the claim. How this can be explained, perhaps, by the honorable member from South Carolina, the chairman of the Galphin committee, (Mr. BURT,) when he addresses the House. That gentleman now thinks, "that the claim of the representatives of George Galphin was not a just demand against the United States." The gentleman did not think so in August, 1818; for I have before me a letter, published evidently by authority, from a Georgia paper, which, as part of the history of this case, I read to the House.

[Here is the article which Mr. S. had before him:]

From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle and Sentinel.

THE GALPHIN CLAIM.—MR. BURT.

You are requested to publish the following letter. The original has been sent to Washington:

WASHINGTON, 14 August 1849.

"DEAR SIR: I have the pleasure to say that the bill in which you are interested has just been signed by the Speaker of the House, and will be approved by the President."

"With great respect, your obedient servant,"

"ARMISTEAD BERT."

"MR. M. GALPHIN."

Early memories require remembrance. They are now supplied, because they are refreshing.

The bill for the relief of Galphin passed on Saturday, the 12th August. It was approved on the 14th, (Sunday intervened.) "Whose helper was ploughed" with in the mean time? The "will" of the then President was spoken of as a "fixed fact."

His approval was known in advance, or the guessing was as close as to have astonished the artistic skill of the East.

As "a dolphin of the woods and a wild boar of seas," we submit the following resolution:

"That the claim of the representatives of George Galphin was not a just demand against the United States."

Verily "the pleasure" of '18 ascended in '50. It had a vinegar twang, and fit only for common "pickling."

In good sooth, the "will" of the President was pinched, in 1818, into an "approved" form. In 1850 it has been unbuttoned or unshined.

Old-fashioned! Mr. Burt is clever on a congratulation and resolution. Let us be thankful and watch.—Oscar.

Now, sir, it does seem that the gentleman from South Carolina had informed the President, Mr. Polk, of the merits of this bill.

Mr. Burt (Mr. STANLY yielding the floor for explanation) desired to say a single word, and no more. It was faintly in his remembrance that such a letter as the gentleman from North Carolina had read, was hastily written by him at his desk in this Hall, for the purpose of saving the bill. But he considered it due to the President to say, that he had never had a word with that high functionary on the subject, and that he had no peculiar means of information. What he wrote was a mere expression of opinion.

Mr. STANLY. But the gentleman had evidently watched the progress of the bill with interest. As Mr. Polk had vetoed the French spoliation bill, he might with as much propriety have vetoed this; for Mr. Polk was Speaker, if I mistake not, in 1836, when the Galphin claim was discussed in Congress. The gentleman from South Carolina evidently thought the claim an honest one then; for he raised no objection, as he might have done. He seems to have been acquainted with the passage of the bill, and informed his friend—the bill "will be approved by the President," for he watched its progress with parental solicitude—watched when the Speaker signed the bill, and informed Dr. M. Galphin that the bill "will be approved by the President." The inference is irresistible, that the chairman of the Galphin committee had informed Mr. Polk of the merits of the bill; that Mr. Polk thought the claim was just and ought to be paid; and that he personally and officially approved the bill.

Then, as far as this is a party matter, Mr. Polk, who approved the bill, Mr. Walker who examined and paid the principal, and the chairman of the select committee, who stands high in the estimation of his party, who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—these three distinguished Democrats are as thoroughly "Galphinized," as any three Whigs can be, in or out of the Cabinet. Let it be particularly observed, that in his testimony before the committee, Mr. Robert J. Walker said of the Galphin claim, "the facts being of a peculiar character the claim for interest remains an open question." And he also said, "that if he entertained serious doubts on a question of law, and demanded the opinion of the Attorney General on that question, he would abide by his opinion."

The attempt is now made to give this matter a party aspect—to blame the Whig party for it. The gentleman from Ohio, on the committee, (Mr. DISNEY,) has exerted his talents to the utmost on the question of interest. The gentleman has signally failed in his effort to justify Mr. Walker for paying the principal, and to blame Mr. Meredith for paying the interest. The gentleman, I take it, is no lawyer; if ever he studied law, he did so but a short while, and quit many years since, for he is evidently one of those scholars who "hold the eel of obedience by the tail." His speech has shown he was not well informed in legal matters. The law is a jealous mistress, and requires undivided attention; and when a lawyer turns politician, he soon finds his law knowledge leaves him faster than Bob Acres' courage recedes out at the ends of his fingers. I have no respect for the legal opinions of lawyer politicians. This same gentleman, in a speech made in the early part of this session, declared that though he held the Wilcox provision constitutional, yet he should be glad of an opportunity of sending a bill with that proviso in it, to the President. To do a great right, he would be willing to do a little wrong, was the argument used by the gentleman.

Now, sir, I want no better reply to this speech and argument of his on the Galphin business, than the fact, that he thinks he could support the Con-

stitution of the United States, by sending an unconstitutional measure to the President! Truly, Mr. Crawford has little reason to be hurt at the opinion this gentleman may entertain of the propriety of his conduct.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of some of those who have come on the stage within two or three years past, to a dark page in the history of the Democratic party in this country. Some of the loudest in their denunciation are evidently uninformed in the history of Democratic "Galphinizing." I invite the attention of the youthful Democracy to Reports of Committees of 24th Cong., 3d Session, 1835-'36, Report No. 313. After the whole country had been astounded by the defalcation of Swartwout, and by the correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and certain receivers of public money a committee was appointed, who investigated and made the report I have referred to. Let me mention a few cases in this report: Mr. William Linn was a receiver of public money at Galena. On the 23d of June, 1834—mark the dates—Mr. Taney, Secretary of the Treasury, began his complaints, that Mr. Linn did not promptly deposit the money in his hands in bank. The correspondence continued by Mr. Woodbury, as Secretary of the Treasury, in October, 1834, to January 26, 1838, when Mr. Woodbury informed him his resignation was accepted by the President; and Mr. Woodbury regretted "so large a balance stand unadjusted in your hands. Balance due from Linn, fifty-five thousand nine hundred and sixty-two dollars and six cents, (\$55,962 06.) Is this "Galphinizing" or not?

Take another case, Rep. No. 313, page 167: W. P. Harris was receiver at Columbus, Mississippi. The correspondence with him commences in January, 1833. In March, 1834, the Secretary makes complaints of Harris's conduct. In August, 1835, Mr. Woodbury threatens to dismiss him. In the correspondence is a letter from John F. H. Claiborne, dated September 15, 1835, in which he speaks of Harris as "one of the main pillars of the Democratic cause, and one of the earliest and most distinguished friends of the Administration in Mississippi. His family and connections are extremely influential, and all of them are cooperating with us in the arduous struggle which we are now making." Mr. Harris is represented as an honorable man of "diffused and deserved popularity." This letter was sent by Mr. Harris to the Secretary of the Treasury of the President.

In August, 1836—mark the dates—Mr. Harris writes a letter to the President, tendering his resignation, in which he uses the following language, which I read:

"In conclusion, I will take the liberty of recommending you, for appointment as my successor, Colonel Gordon D. Boyd, of Atlanta county. You are probably acquainted with his public character, as he has been for several years a prominent member of our State Legislature, and has been an ardent supporter of your thoughtful administration and an unyielding advocate of the principle of Democracy."

He was also recommended as the "warm personal friend" of W. P. Harris.

On page 181 of Rep. 313, is this short statement:

"Balance due from Mr. Harris, one hundred and nine thousand, one hundred and seventy-eight dollars and eight cents—(\$109,178 08)."—See statement.

Is this "Galphinizing"—or only supporting the principles of Democracy?

In this all? Not quite.

In December, 1836, Mr. Woodbury commences his correspondence with "Colonel Gordon D. Boyd," and continues not quite a year. Remember, Colonel Boyd was an "ardent supporter" of the Administration, and an "unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy," the chosen successor of General Harris—his "warm personal friend"—of General Harris who "enjoyed such a diffused and deserved popularity," and was one of the "main pillars of the Democratic cause."

Well, what was the result of Boyd's appointment? In June, 1837, Mr. Garreche, appointed by Mr. Woodbury to examine the affairs of the office in Columbus, reported as follows, and I call the particular attention of the anti-Galphin orators to it. Mr. Garreche says to the Secretary of the Treasury:

"The man seems really penitent, and I am inclined to think, in common with his friends, that he is honest, and has been led away from his duty by the example of his predecessor, and a certain looseness in the code of morality, which here does not move in so limited a circle as it does with us at home. Another receiver would probably follow in the footsteps of the two. You will not, therefore, be surprised if I recommend his being retained, in preference to another appointment; for he has his hands full now, and will not be disposed to speculate any more."—Page 189 of Report 313.

And was Colonel Gordon D. Boyd, the "warm personal friend" of General Harris, the "ardent supporter of the Administration," the "unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy," the "really penitent" Colonel Boyd—was he removed? No, sir: on the 7th of October, 1837, Mr. Woodbury acknowledged the receipt of his resignation!! On page 189, is this short statement:

"G. D. Boyd is indebted fifty thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven dollars, and twenty-nine cents, (\$59,937 29,) as per last settlement at the Treasury."

Is this "Galphinizing," or only sustaining the principles of Democracy?

Next is the case of Lathbury Hawkins, receiver at Helena: on page 192 of the report, is this statement:

"Balance due from Mr. Hawkins, one hundred thousand dollars, (\$100,000,) per last settlement at the Treasury."

Mr. A. G. Mitchell, receiver at Calumet, on page 196, is the next case—

"Mr. Mitchell, a late receiver at Calumet, is indebted fifty-four thousand six hundred and twenty-six dollars and fifty-five cents, (\$54,626 55.)"

The next case of Democratic "Galphinizing," is that of Mr. Childress, receiver at Helena, Louisiana: on page 199 of the report, it is said:

"Balance due from Paris Childress, twelve thousand four hundred and forty-nine dollars and seventy-six cents, (\$12,449 76.)"

The next case is that of Mr. J. Allen, receiver at Tallahassee: on page 218 of the report, it is stated that—

"Mr. Allen is indebted to the Government, twenty-six thousand six hundred, and ninety-one dollars and fifty-seven cents, (\$26,691 57.)"

Then there is a correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and Mr. Spencer, receiver at Fort Wayne. I wish to read one or two interesting extracts.

Mr. Haden stated, for the information of the gentleman from North Carolina and of the House, that Col. John Spencer was not now, nor at the time to which the gentleman refers, a defaulter to the Government, but, on the contrary, was both then and now a creditor of the Government; and a previous Congress and the Executive officers of the Government have so decided.

Mr. Stanly said, he was glad to hear that one man had paid what he owed.

Mr. Dunham explained that Col. Spencer was improperly set down as a defaulter, the Government being in fact in his debt.

Mr. Stanly. Was not judgment obtained against him by the United States?

Mr. Dunham. It was improperly obtained, and was afterwards released when the facts were made known.

Mr. Stanly said he should be glad to know how the release was obtained: was it because he was "a pillar of Democracy?" But it was not the amount of the defalcation in this case that I was commenting on. It was to the reasons given by Mr. Hendricks, and Mr. Woodbury's answer, to which I ask attention—especially the reasons why Mr. Woodbury ought not to remove him.

After various complaints from Mr. Woodbury, Mr. William Hendricks writes to him in behalf of Mr. Spencer. In that letter Mr. Hendricks says:

"It would to some extent produce excitement, if he were removed, for he has many warm and influential friends, both at Fort Wayne and in Dearborn county, from which he removed to his present residence. Better let it be."

In answer to this "Better let it be," Mr. Woodbury wrote a short letter to Mr. Hendricks as General Cass did to the Chicago Convention—Hear it!

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, September 7, 1836.

Sir: Your letter of the 31st ultimo is received, and I am happy to inform you that Mr. Spencer's explanations have been such, that he will probably continue in office.

I am very respectfully, your obedient servant,

LEVI WOODBURY,

Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. WILLIAM HENDRICKS.

The reason of Mr. Spencer continuing in office will be known, when we hear the following from his letter to Mr. Woodbury, dated October 27, 1836:

"My Democratic friends think that I ought not to leave, until after we hold an election for President, on the 7th of November, which I have concluded to wait."

"The Democratic party—the election—the main pillars of the Democratic cause—the unyielding advocates of the principles of Democracy"—these were the reasons assigned for keeping men in office, who had neglected their duties, abused their trusts, and kept the public money for their own purposes.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in parentheses, what I think of General Cass's letters. That he was more unfortunate in his Nicholson, than in his Chicago letter.

We never could agree in the South in construing the Nicholson letter. General Cass was as clear and definite in his letter, as Launcelot, in the Merchant of Venice was, when he gave old Gobbo directions for finding the way to the Jew's house.

"Gobbo.—Master young gentleman, I pray you, which is the way to Master Jew's?"

"Launcelot.—Turn upon your right hand, at the next turning, but, at the next turning of all on your left; marry, at the very next turning, turn of a hand, but turn, down indirectly to the Jew's house."

Turn a hard way to hit—as hard as to hit General Cass's meaning.

I will not detain the House further by a reference to other cases mentioned in the same report.

But, sir, it may be said, we heard all this in 1840; the judgment of the country has been passed on these transactions. That excuse will not answer. I have for some weeks past been making inquiries relative to the office-holders under Mr. Polk. I suppose that when the office-holders in this city were encouraged to leave their offices, and make speeches against General Taylor—when funds were collected out of the clerks by your public officers—when some of them were engaged in writing party essays, that some of the Government money was probably used for the election, by the "pillars of the Democratic party." I have judged correctly, and I invite the special attention of all those who have been thundering anathemas against the Galphin claim, to bear my facts.

I find that various public officers, such as Indian agents, collectors of customs, contractors, navy agents, marshals, pension agents, &c., holding office under the last Administration, have retained in their hands, or misapplied to use no hands, words—the public money intrusted to their custody, to an amount of nearly one million of dollars. I have a table before me, and come of

the names I will give: many of the names I do not wish to bring to public notice, because all of them have not been mentioned in the newspapers of the day.

Here Mr. Stanly read the names of Denby, Board, Collins, Beach, and some others referred to in this list.