

TERMS: ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE. For six months, 75 cents. All NEW subscriptions must be paid in advance.

WHIG NOMINATIONS.

For Canal Commissioner, JOSHUA DUNGA, of Bucks County. For Auditor General, HENRY W. SNYDER, of Union County. For Surveyor General, JOSEPH HENDERSON, of Washington Co.

Notices of Advertisements. The attention of business men is invited to the advertisement of George W. Ridgway. Persons indebted to Sheriff M'Mangill for costs will find an interesting notice from Esquire Stoner in another column.

The Nomination for Congress. Mr. Calvin still adheres to his determination to decline a re-nomination for Congress, and it now becomes our duty to look around for some one qualified to represent the Iron District in that body.

The Bellefonte Whig, in an article on Mr. Calvin's declination, pays a just tribute to his worth. It says: "We sincerely regret the determination of Mr. Calvin. He had given entire satisfaction to the people of this county by the manner in which he has represented their interests in Congress, and the Whig party looked to his re-nomination with a unanimity we have rarely seen settled on a public servant."

The Whigs of Juniata County. The whigs of Juniata county have nominated Col. Eli Sliker, of Union county, for Assembly; Noah Hertzler, of Turbett, Commissioner; Wm. Dunn, of Fayette, County Surveyor; or Joseph Wallace, of Lack, Auditor.

The Cabinet. The vacancies in the War Department and the Interior, have been filled by the President, by the appointment of Mr. CONRAD of Louisiana to the first, and Hon. THOS. M. T. M'KENNAN of Pennsylvania to the latter. The Cabinet, therefore, is complete as follows:

Secretary of State, Mr. WEBSTER. Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. CORWEN. Secretary of the Navy, Mr. GRAHAM. Postmaster General, Mr. HALL. Secretary of the Interior, Mr. M'KENNAN. Secretary of War, Mr. CONRAD. Attorney General, Mr. CRITTENDEN.

J. Porter Brawley. The Crawford Gazette says of the loco-foco candidate for Surveyor General: "We stated, as soon as the nomination of Mr. Brawley was known, that he would be distanced badly in this native county. We were fully aware of his unpopularity, and spoke then from the book."

LA FAYETTE COLLEGE, located at Easton, Pa., will commence its Winter Session on the 31st day of October next, under the charge of a talented and efficient faculty. The instruction will be thorough and complete, embracing all the branches of a full collegiate course, and a Christian, Literary and Scientific Education.

GODEY'S LADY'S BOOK for September is receiving high encomiums from its subscribers for the beauty of its embellishment and excellent reading matter. It deserves all the praise bestowed upon it.

gentleman of respectable abilities, has been Attorney General; but I think the only monument to his memory, as Attorney General, will be, that after a few of his speeches the Supreme Court were compelled to adopt a two hour rule. Now compare his services with those of Reverdy Johnson. We have seen published the opinion of the Supreme Court, in the case of Fleming vs. Page, involving the right to levy duties on goods imported into certain ports in Mexico during the war.

Now hear the following, ye thunderers of "Galphin"—pay especial attention to this: "Yet the committee have ascertained by calculation, that this document, at the rate of 1819, would not amount to more than two thousand eight hundred and sixty-four dollars and fifty cents, (\$2,864 50.)"

Yes, sir, twelve thousand five hundred dollars were paid for this pamphlet. Mr. Ritchie, I am informed, was the surety of Mr. Belt for the performance of this contract; he was the arbitrator, who settled the price for Belt, and, as I learn from a member of this House, Mr. Ritchie is also the assignee of Belt, and holds the contract for his own advantage!

Mr. HAYMOND. He is one of the "elite" of the Richmond Democracy. Mr. STANLEY. Yes, sir, as my friend from Virginia says, because he is one of the "elite"—one of the aristocratic Democracy of Virginia. Besides the large sums unjustly withheld by these public officers—by the Denbys, the Wetmores, and the Patrick Collins of the last administration—there are others still.

I hold in my hand a list—"Balances due from collectors and surveyors of customs, who were appointed between the 1st of March, 1845, and the 4th of March, 1849, and are now out of office;" and that balance is one hundred and thirty-eight dollars and sixteen cents, (\$139.378-16). And these, sir, are some of those poor calumniated victims of proscription, removed from office by General Taylor!

There are some instances of abuse too to which I wish now to refer. The last administration had its favorites, besides the defaulters, and they were well taken care of. Take the case of Mr. A. J. Donelson. In 1846, in April, he was minister to Berlin. He had an outfit of \$9,000 and his salary. In 1848 he was sent by Mr. Polk minister to Germany, or the German Confederation. For this he received another outfit and salary. He was well paid for travelling a few hundred miles, and had nothing to do when he got there; for the German Confederation soon ceased to exist.

Mr. STANLEY. In other words, Mr. Collins, set up an outfit; and does not every defaulter, with more or less success, do the same? There is another statement of this case, however, which does not exactly tally with that of the gentleman from Ohio. They all, when they have misappropriated the public money, make out new accounts. But why has not the gentleman from Ohio called down indignation on Collins? Why has he not investigated this case?

Mr. DISNEY was understood to say he had been endeavoring to have the Collins account settled. Mr. STANLEY congratulated the gentleman on his labor of love. From his argument in the Galphin case he was no doubt an admirable defender, a friend of Collins. W. B. Scott, navy agent in this city, one of the most active officeholders in collecting money out of public officers here in 1848, only owes the moderate sum of \$17,897 37. How much of this money was spent against the election of General Taylor no Whig can tell.

Now, sir, this information I get from reliable sources. And this is not all. If gentlemen will call for information, I will show other defalcations. What will the Democracy of the country say to all this? Will they not say that those who are crying out "Galphin! Galphin!" are raining at a gnat and swallowing a camel?

One other item of Galphinizing in this city I must mention. The editor of the Union newspaper in this city has been among the foremost in denouncing the Cabinet as the "Galphin Cabinet," and abusing the Whigs as the "Galphin party."

Let us examine his conduct a moment. I hold in my hand Senate report No. 149, made by Mr. Borland on the 8th June, 1850; from which it appears that the Senate, at the last session, ordered to be printed ten thousand copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the cases of Smith vs. Turner, and Norris vs. the city of Boston, making a pamphlet of one hundred and eighty-one pages.

Mr. Borland is a Locofoco, a Senator from Arkansas, and a gentleman of character and intelligence. It seems that Mr. Belt, who is "printer to the Senate," has received more than twelve thousand dollars for printing this pamphlet. According to his construction of the contract, he charged the moderate sum of thirty-seven thousand two hundred dollars, for the ten thousand copies! Mr. Borland makes various estimates of the cost of this printing. If charged fairly, he says, under Tiffin and Streep's contract, third Congress, the total cost for this printing would amount to only five hundred and twenty-two dollars and fifty cents, (\$522 50!)

Mr. Borland: "The committee do not suppose that it could be deemed reasonable to exact a higher rate of compensation than the rates established by the joint resolution of 1819; for the printers are willing now, and have ever proposed to relinquish their contracts, and undertake to execute all the public printing at rates less than those of 1819, reduced to the extent of twenty per cent."

For warrant No. 2,662, dated 18 March, 1848, for \$9,000 00 do 6,192, do 25 Nov., do, 6,000 00 do 7,301, do 4 Dec., do, 375 31 do 7,905, do 2 Feb'y, 1849, 500 00 do 7,905, do 9 March, do, 116 00 do 809, do 4 Sept. do, 313 00 \$16,291 31 And for balance due to him on settlement, 17,851 91

Whole amount received by Mr. Clifford from 18th March, 1848, to 31st September, 1849, \$51,210 22

Is this "Galphinizing," or what is it? And now those who have tolerated all these abuses are denouncing the Whig party as the "Galphin party." Truly, sir, do these noisy declaimers resemble a Democratic overseer I once heard of in the southern country. He had been informed that the squirrels were eating the corn, and he took six good men from their work to kill the squirrels, while he kept a pet bear who was allowed to devour corn entirely uncontrolled. I am not aware what public service Mr. Clifford has done to entitle him to such reward. He is a

That expense 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 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 against the Galphin claim to hear 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 harsher words—the public money entrusted to their custody to an amount of nearly ONE MILLION OF DOLLARS! I have a table before me and some 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. STANLEY read the names of Denby, Beard, Collins, Beach, and some others referred to in this list.

Table with 3 columns: Name, In what capacity, Amount claimed. Includes Nathaniel Denby, E. L. Beard, Patrick Collins, William B. Scott, John Beach, Richard Hewitt, G. H. Kennerly, P. M. Wetmore.

Mr. Wetmore, navy agent, has paid since he was sued, \$25,000. Yes, sir, nearly one million of dollars is the amount of defalcation specified in this list.

Patrick Collins, of Cincinnati, "Galphinizes" \$181,390 49 in the district represented by the gentleman (Mr. DISNEY) whose lucid arguments on interest will confound the Supreme Court. He only gave a bond for ten thousand dollars, but as he was "a pillar of Democracy," the gentleman is mute as to this defalcation.

Mr. DISNEY rose to explain in reference to the case of Collins. The defalcation alleged against Collins was on account of fees and uncollected bonds, which were explained, and were handed over by Collins to his successor, by whom they are still held.

Mr. STANLEY. In other words, Mr. Collins, set up an outfit; and does not every defaulter, with more or less success, do the same? There is another statement of this case, however, which does not exactly tally with that of the gentleman from Ohio. They all, when they have misappropriated the public money, make out new accounts. But why has not the gentleman from Ohio called down indignation on Collins? Why has he not investigated this case?

Mr. DISNEY was understood to say he had been endeavoring to have the Collins account settled. Mr. STANLEY congratulated the gentleman on his labor of love. From his argument in the Galphin case he was no doubt an admirable defender, a friend of Collins. W. B. Scott, navy agent in this city, one of the most active officeholders in collecting money out of public officers here in 1848, only owes the moderate sum of \$17,897 37. How much of this money was spent against the election of General Taylor no Whig can tell.

Now, sir, this information I get from reliable sources. And this is not all. If gentlemen will call for information, I will show other defalcations. What will the Democracy of the country say to all this? Will they not say that those who are crying out "Galphin! Galphin!" are raining at a gnat and swallowing a camel?

One other item of Galphinizing in this city I must mention. The editor of the Union newspaper in this city has been among the foremost in denouncing the Cabinet as the "Galphin Cabinet," and abusing the Whigs as the "Galphin party."

Let us examine his conduct a moment. I hold in my hand Senate report No. 149, made by Mr. Borland on the 8th June, 1850; from which it appears that the Senate, at the last session, ordered to be printed ten thousand copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the cases of Smith vs. Turner, and Norris vs. the city of Boston, making a pamphlet of one hundred and eighty-one pages.

Mr. Borland is a Locofoco, a Senator from Arkansas, and a gentleman of character and intelligence. It seems that Mr. Belt, who is "printer to the Senate," has received more than twelve thousand dollars for printing this pamphlet. According to his construction of the contract, he charged the moderate sum of thirty-seven thousand two hundred dollars, for the ten thousand copies! Mr. Borland makes various estimates of the cost of this printing. If charged fairly, he says, under Tiffin and Streep's contract, third Congress, the total cost for this printing would amount to only five hundred and twenty-two dollars and fifty cents, (\$522 50!)

That expense 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 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 against the Galphin claim to hear my facts.

anti-Galphin orators to it. Mr. Garesche 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—as 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, (\$50,937 29,) as per last settlement at the Treasury."

Is this "Galphinizing," or only sustaining the principles of Democracy? Next is the case of Littlebury Hawkins, receiver at Helena. On page 192 of the report is this statement:

"Balance due from Mr. Hawkins, one hundred thousand dollars, (\$100,000 00) per last settlement."

Mr. A. G. Mitchell, receiver at Cahaba; on page 196 is this remark:

"Mr. Mitchell, a late receiver at Cahaba, 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. HARBAN 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. STANLEY 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. STANLEY. Was not judgement obtained against him by the United States? Mr. DUNHAM. It was improperly obtained, and was afterwards released when the facts were made known.

Mr. STANLEY 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 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."