

THE STAR AND NORTH CAROLINA GAZETTE.

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, MAY 30, 1838.

VOL. XXIX NO. 23

THOMAS J. LEMAY,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS.

Subscription, three dollars per annum—on half in advance.
Persons residing without the State will be required to pay the whole amount of the year's subscription in advance.

ADVERTISING.
For every square (not exceeding 16 lines this size) first insertion, one dollar; each subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

The advertisements of Clerks and Sheriffs will be charged 25 per cent. higher, and a deduction of 3 1/2 per cent. will be made from the advertisements for advertisers by the year. Letters to the Editor must be post-paid.

Facts for the People.

MR. BOND'S SPEECH CONTINUED.

Next, as to the War Department. In 1823, the Secretary of War employed a chief clerk, besides seventeen clerks and two messengers. His salary, and their compensation amounted to \$28,650. The business of Indian affairs was then managed by him also. In 1825, the Secretary of that Department employed, inclusive of the Indian business, about forty clerks, besides messengers. The joint salaries and compensation of the whole amount to \$63,810.

In 1828, we hear nothing of a commanding general's office, with its clerk and messenger.

In 1838, the commanding general is allowed a clerk at \$1,200, and a messenger at \$600 per year.

In 1828, the Adjutant General's office employed three clerks, whose joint compensation was \$3,950.

In 1838, the Adjutant General employs seven clerks and a messenger, whose joint compensation is \$8,225.

In 1828, the Paymaster General employed three clerks, whose united compensation was \$3,900.

In 1838, the salary of the same number of clerks is \$4,290, besides the messenger's salary.

In 1828, I have been unable to discover any allowance for clerks to the Quartermaster General.

In 1838, that officer employs in the office at Washington seven clerks, whose united compensation is \$7,300.

In 1828, the Ordnance office employed three clerks, whose joint salary was \$2,950.

In 1838, the Ordnance office employs nine clerks, besides a messenger, and their aggregate compensation is \$9,225.

In 1828, the Subsistence Department employed four clerks, whose joint compensation was \$2,950.

In 1838, the Subsistence Department employs four clerks, and a messenger, whose joint compensation is \$3,880.

In 1828, the Surgeon General was allowed a clerk at \$1,150 per year.

In 1838, the Surgeon General is allowed a clerk at \$1,260, and a messenger, at \$600 per year.

In 1828, the business of Indian affairs was discharged at the War Department, by some one or two of the seventeen clerks which I first mentioned.

In 1838, this Indian business appears to constitute a grand division. We now hear of the "Indian Department," with a commissioner, whose salary is \$5,000, a chief clerk, at \$1,600, and eleven clerks and two messengers, the joint compensation and salaries being \$19,400.

In 1828, there was one Superintendent of Indian affairs, who was paid \$1,500 a year, twenty-one Indian agents, twenty-eight sub-agents, and thirty-nine interpreters.

In 1838, we find four superintendents of Indian affairs, with salaries of \$1,500 each per year; six superintendents of emigration, with salaries of \$2,000 each per year; ten Indian agents, with salaries of \$1,500 each per year; fourteen Indian sub-agents, with salaries of \$750 per year; thirty-three commissioners and special agents, who are paid from five to eight dollars per day, and from 1,500 to 3,000 per year; fifteen conducting & enrolling agents, at 3, 4, and 5 dollars per day; 2 conducting exploring parties, at 3 and 5 dollars per day; two valuing agents at 4 dollars each per day; eight collecting agents, at 2 dollars 50 cents per day each; two issuing agents at 1 dollar per day each; one disbursing agent at five dollars per day; sixteen assistant agents at 3 and 4 dollars per day, and from 500 to 1,200 each per year; thirty-one interpreters at agencies, at \$00 each per year; fourteen interpreters in the emigration of Indians, at 2 50 and 3 per day; fifteen physicians, at salaries varying from 3, 5, & 6 dollars a day, to 84 dollars per month; eleven clerks (other than those in the office at Washington) at salaries varying from 3 and 5 dollars a day to 50 and 50 dollars per month, and 800 and 1,000 per year; fifty-three blacksmiths, with salaries varying from 240 to 600 dollars per year; twenty farmers and assistants, at 2, 3, 5 and 600 per year; eighteen teachers with various salaries, from 500 to 800 per year; five millers, with salaries of 5 and 600 dollars; one surveyor, at 8 dollars per day; the whole concluding with five miscellaneous agents, with salaries of 1 dollar per day, and 600 per year.

But even this is not all. The Commissioner of Indian affairs says the list given by him in the Blue Book is not

accurate or complete. He leaves room to add or alter. Here, indeed, is a display of patronage! Ought we not to be astonished to find this state of things, under an administration whose friends professed to be shocked at a multiplication of offices, and re-published, in the report of this House in 1828, the warning of that Chief Magistrate, who said: "Considering the general tendency to multiply offices & dependencies, and to increase expense to the ultimate term of burden which the citizen can bear, it behooves us to avail ourselves of every occasion which presents itself for taking off the surcharge." It is appropriate too, now, to refer gentlemen to the census which that report cast on the Secretary of War in 1828, for paying 753 dollars for additional clerk hire in the business of Indian affairs.

We will now look to the Post Office Department. The General Post Office, as it was then called, had the good fortune not only to escape the censure, but to enlist the praise of that fault-finding era. I leave it for those who were familiar with the motives and political currents of that day, to account for this. The committee said of it—"The efficiency of this branch of the public service is in a condition highly improved and improving." My first remark on this is, that the Post Office Department passed into the hands of General Jackson in a healthy and efficient state. A few years, under his reform, reduced it to chaos & insolvency. The details of its mismanagement have been long since proved. The evidence is on file here and in the Senate, with the reports of the several committees appointed to investigate its abuses. I refer gentlemen to the files, and will not dwell on the various abuses which were designated and established. Their enormity, coupled with the fact of the borrowing money on public account by the Post Master General, without law or authority, alarmed the country. But bad as all this was, and used, as the pecuniary patronage had been, to confer personal benefits on favorites, until the disorder and insolvency of the Department became apparent, still the political uses which had been made of the appointing patronage were not disclosed, and now never will be. The present Postmaster General, Amos Kendall, tells us in his account of the late destruction of that department by fire, that all the books, papers and files of the department were saved, except the files of the appointment office, and that these were destroyed!

In the first six years of Gen. Jackson's administration, about 1300 postmasters were removed from office, and, in most of the cases, without the assignment of any cause. When certain members of the committees of the Senate and House, appointed, in 1833-'34, to investigate the abuses of that department, attempted to get at the files and correspondence of this appointment office, with a view to ascertain and report whether the reasons for these removals were prompted by high and just public considerations, or by mere party political expediency, they were denied the right by the head of the department and by the friends of the administration, who composed a majority on one of these committees! Was not this inquiry just? I refer you, sir, to Mr. Benton's famous report and bill providing for the disclosure of reasons in case of removal from office. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to your own remarks, and to those of your friends, in the debate on Mr. Saunders' resolution, which I have already quoted. But, above all, I refer you to the remarks of the illustrious Madison, unrivalled as he was in the knowledge of the letter and spirit of the Constitution and laws, and in purity and honesty of purpose. As early as 1789, in the memorable debate on the power of the executive to remove from office, he not only denied the right to exercise this power capriciously, and without assigning adequate reasons, but he thought it would be such a bold assumption of lawless power, that he thus expressed himself: "I own it is an abuse of power which exceeds my imagination, and of which I can form no rational conception."

But when Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Benton (both of whom were on the committee which reported the bill to prevent the abuse of this patronage of appointment) came into power, this changed their tone. If not their principles. Removals from office immediately followed, and they deny any obligation to assign reasons! Is it not strange, too—nay, is it not mysterious, that, in the configuration of the Post Office, the only papers and files destroyed should be those relating to the exercise, if not the abuse of the power of removal from office—the very papers which the Postmaster General refused to suffer the committees of investigation to examine?

I said Mr. Van Buren changed his tone on this subject. I will at once prove it. The Journal of the Senate shows that he was one of the select committee who reported the bill already referred to. He entered the office of Secretary of State with the commencement of Gen. Jackson's administration. One of his first official acts was the removal of a meritorious clerk from his office in that department, and a positive refusal to assign any reason for it! The gentleman removed is now a member of this House, (Mr. Slade of Vermont,) and the voice of the people has sustained him whom the despotism of the Executive patronage sought to destroy.

The manner in which this patronage is abused, and the readiness and almost telegraphic dispatch with which the wires of party machinery are felt throughout and from the most distant parts of the Union, may be imagined after reading this laconic note, written by Mr. Van Buren, soon after entering on the duties of Secretary of State, to a gentleman in Louisiana:

"Washington, April 20, 1829.
"My dear Sir: I have the honor of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 21st ult., and of informing you that the removals and appointments you recommended were made on the day your letter was received."
"With respect your friend, &c."
"M. VAN BUREN."

And, so far from being willing to reduce the number of Clerks, in his Department, as the People were induced to believe would be done, Mr. Van Buren, when called on for that purpose, saw the whole affair through a new medium, and replied: "My opinion is, that there can be no reduction in the number of officers employed in the Department (of State,) without detriment to the public interests!" And yet the Retrenchment Committee, when Mr. Clay was in that Department, reported "that they felt satisfied that, had the officer at its head concurred with them in the opinion, they might have presented a plan for not only a gradual reduction of the number of clerks, but for an actual increase in the efficiency of their labors."

But other discrepancies between the profession and practice of these reformers remain to be noticed. It will be found that the report of the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Cambreleng) and his friends, condemned "the practice introduced by the Secretaries of the Departments, of sending the reports of their clerks or heads of bureaux, instead of condensing them, and making them substantially, their own communication." This practice, if bad, has never been corrected, but is daily indulged in by all the Departments, as the answers to the calls and resolutions of this House abundantly show. But a still more remarkable commentary follows. When the Department of the Interior, under the heading of John H. Eaton, a zealous reformer, he, too, was called upon to carry out his retrenchment system, and reduce the number of his clerks, in fulfillment of the public expectation, which he and others had excited. To the surprise of all, he referred the subject to the clerk's themselves! and here, sir, is the reply:

"The Department, Jan. 27, 1830.
"Sir: I have the honor to lay before you reports from the several bureaus connected with the War Department, as the subject of a resolution of the 5th inst. referred to me by the Committee on Retrenchment."
"Respectfully,
"J. H. EATON."
"CHARLES A. WICKLIFFE, Esq."

These bureaus, so far from agreeing to part with any of their escutcheons, actually ask for an additional supply! Thus ended that farce!

Another precept.—This retrenchment report alleged that our diplomatic relations and foreign intercourse were unnecessarily expensive, and recommended "a fixed appropriation for the contingencies of each mission," "in no case exceeding \$600, (annually,) to cover the expenses of stationery, postage, office, clerk hire, and all other contingencies whatsoever."

Let us see the practice. Andrew Stevenson, our Minister at London, is allowed for these contingencies, including "presents to the menial officers and servants of the Court, and others, on his presentation, and at Christmas," \$2,098 56, in the space of about a year! The like expenses of nearly all our other foreign missions are in correspondent ratio.

Profession.—The grade of our Foreign Ministers was to be reduced in some instances, especially that at Madrid, to a Charge, with a salary of \$4,500.

Practice.—A Minister Plenipotentiary has been kept at Madrid constantly, and John H. Eaton is now there on a salary of \$9,000, having also received his full bill of the same amount. And during the last session of Congress an attempt was made to increase the salaries of all our foreign Ministers!—Who could have anticipated this from an Administration that proclaimed on this floor, (at least one of its most powerful and influential supporters, the late Mr. Randolph, who joined in the cry of retrenchment here proclaimed, and what he said received the full approbation of "the party?")

"So long as members of Congress, and not of this House only or chiefly, will bow, and cringe, and duck, and fawn, and get out of the way at a pinching vote, or lend a helping hand, at a pinching vote, to obtain these places, I never will consent to enlarge the salary attached to them. We are told that they live at St. Petersburg and London, and that living there is very expensive. Well, sir, who sent it, in there? Were they impressed, sir? Were they taken by a press gang on Tower-hill, knocked down, handcuffed, chucked on board of a tender, and told

that they must take the pay and rations which His Majesty was pleased to allow?"

Now I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, if the moral application of these remarks has not been justly felt "in Congress, and not in this House only or chiefly," under the retrenchment and reform Administration?

Another precept of the reforming report.—The committee thought the mode of "appointing and compensating bearers of despatches, liable to a long objection, prone to degenerate into a species of favoritism little short of a convenient mode of sending favorites abroad to travel for their pleasure, health or instruction, out of the public coffers."

Practice.—The President and his Secretary of State, both Jackson reformers, now take a favorite clerk of the State Department, whose salary at the time was at the rate of 1760 dollars per year, send him as a bearer of despatches to Mexico, and for about three months service, pay him 1212 88 dollars, and suffer him also to draw his clerk's salary for the period of his absence! For this I refer you to the case of Robt. Greenhow, who is the translating clerk of that Department; all the facts of the case being stated in the reports of the Secretary. He excuses this transaction, by saying that the translations which were required during Mr. Greenhow's absence were made at his expense. It might be well to enquire whether any translations were required during that period, and why also it would not have been quite as well to discontinue the salary for the time, and let the Government pay for any translations which were needed. But do we not here distinctly realize what the retrenchment report condemned in these words: "that an actual incumbent is considered to have such a sort of property in the office as to enable him to farm out its duties, and to receive a part of its revenues for doing nothing?"

Another illustration of this "convenient mode of sending favorites abroad," "out of the public coffers," is found in the same list of contingent expenses of foreign intercourse. I allude to the case of Mr. Charles Biddle, who, when by nominated Gen. Jackson for a judgeship in Florida was rejected by the Senate.

After this rejection Mr. Biddle was despatched by the Executive to Central America and New Grenada. What service he rendered we know not; but it appears that from this mission an allowance of \$2,000 has been made. Mr. Charles Biddle is the same gentleman who had a controversy with Mr. Senator Grundy, in which the devotion of the latter to Gen. Jackson was questioned. We learn by one of the printed documents, occasioned by that dispute, that the Senator, for the purpose of proving himself to be what is called a "whole hog Jackson-man," said he "had swallowed the hog not only whole, but wrong end foremost, taking the bristles against the grain; and had gone for all Gen. Jackson's bob-tail nominations, even to Charles Biddle."

You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that great fault was found with Mr. Clay for an allowance to John H. Pleasants, who was employed as bearer of despatches, and sat out on his voyage, but, being taken ill, was obliged to abandon it, though he caused his despatches to be safely delivered. In the account, which I am now examining, we find the sum of \$1,522 72, paid by Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State, to Eleazer Early, sent with despatches for our Charge d'Affaires at Bogota, but which were never delivered. The sickness of Mr. Pleasants furnished no palliation in the minds of the reformers, for the payment made to him, though he caused his despatches to find ample pretext, in the alleged shipment of Mr. Early, to pay him 311 dollars and 35 cents for expenses, 527 dollars and 37 cents for clothing, bedding, and books, lost or abandoned by him, and 714 dollars for one hundred and nineteen days' compensation, at six dollars, per day, though his despatches were never delivered!

At this same time, too, Mr. Early appears to have been receiving a salary of 1,500 dollars a year as Librarian of the House of Representatives! It would seem that Mr. Secretary Forsyth is not a stranger to this "convenient mode of sending favorites abroad, to travel for their pleasure, health or instruction, out of the public coffers."

I also find that 2,515 dollars are charged for contingent expenses of William T. Barry, late Minister to Spain. Now sir, it is well known that Mr. Barry never reached Spain, but died on his way there. He, of course, received the usual salary and outfit; and I am at a loss to know what contingent expenses, incurred by him, could justly be charged to the U. S.

There appears, also, to have been paid to John R. Clay, in 1836, 3,381 dollars and 41 cents, as "compensation for certain diplomatic services." This gentleman, at that time, held the place of Secretary of Legation at St. Petersburg, with a salary of 2,000 dollars a year, and the payment to him of the further sum of 3,381 dollars and 41 cents may be justly questioned.

Other items, indicative of extravagance of favoritism, may be seen in this contingent expense account of foreign missions, but I will not stop to specify them.

It will also be found that, in the days of this "searching operation" and "reform," the standing committees of this House on the expenditures of the several departments attended to their vocations. But, very soon after General Jackson came into power, these committees became so much a matter of mere form that the chairman of one of them declared here, during the last Congress, he had never even thought it worth his while to convene his committee, and he appeared, quite surprised, or at all events assumed, that any inquiry was expected to be made in regard to the expenses of these departments! This state of things forms a strong contrast with the report made here in April, 1828, by Mr. Blair, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Public Accounts and Expenditures in the State Department. He, you know, Mr. Speaker, was a Jackson reformer; like the Select Committee, he found every thing wrong, and promised to correct it. The purchase of books, the employment of a librarian, and many other things, were censured—even the right to purchase & print or likeness of Gen. Washington, to be questioned in the Department, was suspended. How stands the matter now? Why large sums of money are yearly expended for the library of the State Department, and many books purchased, which are certainly unnecessary.

Besides the purchase of books, periodicals, and newspapers, made for this Department by its disbursing agent at home, there was expended in London, during last year, for similar objects, nearly 500 dollars. A librarian is employed, at a salary of 1,540 dollars, equal to that paid to the librarian of the great public library of Congress.—All this, too, sir, under the auspices of gentlemen who said that this part of the expenses of that Department was censurable, and ought to be dispensed with, as all the officers of the Government could well avail themselves of the public library at the Capitol. But, Mr. Speaker, the times changed, and Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Forsyth changed with them. The State Department is now laid off into grand divisions. When Mr. Clay had charge of it, the Blue Book exhibited a list of a dozen names, all under the head of clerks. One of these acted as secretary for the Department, and his salary was 1,150 dollars; another paid out the funds, and was charged with the contingent expenses accounts, and he received 1,150 dollars a year. How soon is all this simplicity and economy forgotten! The Blue Book of last year divides this Department into a "Diplomatic Bureau," a "Consular Bureau," a "Home Bureau," a "Translator," whose salary is 1,760 dollars, a "Disbursing Agent," whose salary is 1,593 dollars, a "Librarian," whose salary is 1,540 dollars, a "Keeper of the Archives," whose salary is 1,540 dollars, and gives one man 960 dollars a year for "packing, filing, arranging, and preserving newspapers and printed documents." This is done by that boasted "democratic party" which affects such holy horror at any appearance of what they call "aristocratic grandeur." If the Turk, whose letters are found in Salamanca, had seen this display of "Bureaus" in the State Department, he would have been better justified in his admiration at "the grand and magnificent scale on which these Americans transact their business." But I have yet to add, that those who questioned the right of the State Department to purchase a print of the immortal Washington have used the money of the People to buy prints of Gen. Jackson, and now of Martin Van Buren, for almost every room in each of the Departments!

Mr. Speaker, during this "searching operation" and "captious fault-finding," every petty expense of the several Departments was looked upon with open censure. I well remember that an item of some few dollars, paid a laborer for destroying the grass which was growing between the bricks of the paved walk leading to the State Department, was held up to public view as a piece of aristocratic extravagance. Now sir, suppose I were to cite to you many similar and equally (if not more) objectionable charges in the present accounts of these Departments—such as cash paid for clearing the snow off the pavements, so that Mr. Forsyth need not wet his feet; 90 dollars a quarter for labor; "54 dollars for sundries," "16 dollars for work" without stating what labor or work. It might have been for killing grass, or raising vegetables for the Secretary. The term "sundries" may conceal the same things, and the curious might inquire what use was made of the fire proof paint for which 78 dollars were paid by the Secretary of State. But the money is well laid out, if it will preserve the edifice! And it is to be regretted that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General had not made similar purchases in time to save their respective buildings. Penknives and scissors, by the dozen and half dozen, are purchased for the Secretary of

State, who also pays a clerk to go to Baltimore to collect a draft. An item of 100 dollars paid by the Secretary of the Treasury for the transportation of money; but how much money, or from whence or where transported, we know not. This last charge is a kind of forgone of the hard-money Sub-Treasury system, by which, instead of transmitting the funds of the Government by means of the cheap, safe, and rapid system of exchange, which prevailed before the banks were "debauched" by Mr. Kendall, the public money is now to be waggoned over the country at great expense and hazard, and always with delay.

SPEECH OF MR. PRESTON,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

On the Annexation of Texas, delivered in the Senate of the United States, April 24, 1838.

The following resolution, offered by Mr. Preston, being the order of the day—

Whereas the just and true boundary of the United States, under the treaty of Louisiana, extended on the southwest of the Rio Grande del Norte, which river continued to be the true boundary line until the territory west of the Sabine was surrendered to Spain by the treaty of 1819: And whereas such surrender of a portion of the territory of the United States is of evil precedent, and questionable constitutionality: And whereas many weighty considerations of policy make it expedient to re-establish the said true boundary, and to annex to the United States the territory occupied by the State of Texas, with the consent of the said State:

Be it therefore resolved, That, with the consent of the said State previously had, and whenever it can be effected consistently with the public faith and treaty stipulations of the United States, it is desirable and expedient to reannex the said territory to the United States.

Mr. Preston said: It is now just two years since the memorable battle of San Jacinto established the independence of Texas. Some time previous to that glorious consummation the republic had announced to the world its declaration of independence, and had fully organized a Government of its own. The struggle with the parent country was brief, but decisive; and, since the 21st of April, 1836, no hostile flag has for one moment been unfurled in Texas. Profound peace has brooded over her fertile lands, making them pregnant; while all the benign influences of order and enlightened liberty have been experienced as intensely as in our own country, or in any other on the face of the earth. Internal tranquility, supremacy of the law, regularity and efficiency of action in all the functions of Government, have realized whatever was predicted or hoped or wished when we hailed the birth of this young republic, and urged her prompt recognition as a member of the family of nations.— While it unfortunately happens that Mexico continues to be agitated by intestine commotions, and embraced by the most pressing difficulties in her foreign relations, her late dependency, the valor and wisdom of whose citizens have made independent, has exhibited a most striking contrast. On one side bloodshed and revolution, a wild and fluctuating state of politics, an ever-changing Government, and a continual succession of conflicting purposes, show the presence of a disorganizing spirit; while, on the other, a growing commerce and an extended agriculture bespeak the settled state of the public mind, reposing under the action of a fully organized and established Government, every department of which is working with gravity and steadiness. Canvassing and elections go on with warmth, and without violence. The President is inaugurated, and Congress assembles, with as little commotion as we have within these walls. Administration and opposition parties differ, debate, and denounce, with as much zeal and as little danger as here; while the judge as peacefully rides the circuit, and the sheriff as promptly executes his judgments; and the constable's staff is as omnipotent as in any other land which reposes under, and is blessed by, the common law. Such is the spectacle which this young State presents to the view of a gratified philanthropy. Thus has she fulfilled the predictions which attended her birth.

The proposition which I now submit in regard to this prosperous and self-dependent State would be indecorous and presumptuous, had not the lead been given by Texas herself. It appears by the correspondence of the envoy extraordinary of that republic with our own Government, that the question of annexation on certain terms and conditions has been submitted to the people of the republic, and decided in the affirmative by a very large majority, whereupon and in pursuance of instructions from his Government, he proposes to open a negotiation for the accomplishment of that object. The correspondence has been communicated upon a call from the House of Representatives, and thus the proposition becomes a fit subject for the deliberations of Congress.

Nor is proposed by my resolution, Mr. President to do any thing which could be justly construed into a case of offense by Mexico. The terms of the resolution guard our relations with that republic; and the spirit in which it is conceived is entirely averse to any

Misses