

Carlisle Herald and Expositor.

A FAMILY NEWSPAPER—DEVOTED TO NEWS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, THE ARTS AND SCIENCES, AGRICULTURE, AMUSEMENT, & C. & C.

Printed and Published, Weekly, by George M. Phillips, in Carlisle, Cumberland County, Pa.

VOLUME XL—No. 38.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 26, 1838.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 2—No. 30.

TERMS.

The "CARLISLE HERALD & EXPOSITOR" will be issued every Tuesday afternoon, at Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. Letters addressed to the editor on business MUST BE POST PAID otherwise they will receive no attention.

AGENTS.

The following named persons have been appointed Agents for the "Carlisle Herald & Expositor," to whom payment for subscription and advertisements can be made.

D. SHELLEY, Esq. Shrewsbury, Cum. Co.
S. T. COVLE, Esq. Newville, do
T. K. WATSON, Esq. Newburgh, do
T. H. HARRIS, Esq. Slipshurg, do
J. W. ANDERSON, Esq. do
J. MATHER, Esq. Hopewell, do
H. WILSON, Esq. Mechanicsburg, do
WILLIAM HARRIS, Esq. Hopewell, do
R. STURGEON, Esq. Clarkstown, do
DR. ASA WHITE, N. W. Cumberland, do
THOS. BLACK, Esq. J. B. Condit, Perry county.
A. BLACK, Esq. Landisburg, do

POETRY.

From the *Louisiana Journal*.

EDWIN GREEN.

I have a fair and gentle form,
Whose heart is pure as I was,
As ever was a maiden's heart,
At fifteen years of age.

She looks as though she were a star,
That from its bowers in heaven,
Looks down, and gazes on a strain
From some bright spirit in heaven.

I do not mean that fatherly
Has never reached her ear;
Equally soft as her song,
Has no effect on her.

For she is all simplicity,
A creature soft and mild—
Though on the eve of womanhood,
In heart a very child.

And yet, within the misty depths
Of her dark and dreamy eyes,
A shadowy glory, like deep thought,
In tender sadness lies.

Her thought her glance still shines as bright
As in her childhood years,
Its witness and its truest mirror
Are softened down by tears.

Tears that steal not from hidden springs,
Of sorrow and regret,
For none but lovely feelings
In her gentle breast have met.

In every year that glazes her eye
From her going bosom flows,
Like dew drops from a golden star,
Or sweetness from a rose.

For 'tis in life's delicious spring,
We oft have memories
That throw around our sunny hearts
A transient cloud of sighs!

For a wondrous change within the heart
As that sweet time is wrought,
When on each it softly falls
A spell of deeper thought.

And she has reached that lovely time,
The sweet poetic age;
When to the eye each flower's leaf
Seems like a glowing page;

For a beauty and a mystery
About the heart is thrown,
When childhood's merry laughter yields
To girlhood's softer tone.

I do not know if I found her heart
Lose yet laid through his wing;
I rather think she's like myself,
An April hearted thing.

I only know that she is fair,
And love's me passing well,
But who this gentle maiden is,
I feel not free to tell.

AMELIA.

POLITICAL.

SPEECH OF MR. BOND, Of Ohio, on the Resolution to correct abuses in the public expenditures, and to separate the Government from the Press.

Delivered in the House of Representatives,
April, 1838.

[Concluded from our last.]

The manner in which this patronage is abused, and the readiness and almost telegraphic despatch 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 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 this 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 interest." 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 their opinion, they might have presented a plan for not only a gradual reduction of the number of clerks, but for an actual increase in 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 bureaus, 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 War passed into the hands 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 public expectation, which he and others had excited. To the surprise of all, he referred the subject to the clerks themselves! and here, sir, is his reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Jan. 27, 1830.

"Sir: I have the honor to lay before you reports from the several bureaus connected with the War Department on 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 esculcheons, actually ask for an additional supply! This 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 mental officers and servants of the Court, and others, on his presentation, and at Christmas," \$2,000 50, in the space of about a year.

The like expenses of nearly all our other foreign missions are in corresponding 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 outfit 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) here proclaimed, and what he said the full approbation of "the party?"

So long as members of Congress, and not of this house only or chiefly, will bow, and duck, and draw, 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 them there? Were they impressed sir? Were they taken by a press-gang on Lower Hill, knocked down, and hand-cuffed, clucked 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 strong objections, 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 \$1,700 per year, send him as bearer of despatches to Mexico, and, for about three months' service, pay him \$1212.88, 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 Robert 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 inquire 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 not be deceived by the retrenchment report, which condemns in these words: "that an actual incumbent is considered to have such a sort of property in the office as to enable him to lean 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 alluded to the case of Mr. Charles Biddle, who, when nominated by General 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 for this mission an allowance of \$7,322.95 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," not only said he "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 be safely delivered. Yet these same gentlemen find ample pretext, in the alleged shipment of Mr. Early, to pay him \$311.36 for expenses, \$227.37 for clothing, bedding, and books, lost or abandoned by him, and \$71.4 for one hundred and nineteen days' compensation, at \$6 per day, though his despatches were never delivered!

At this time, too, Mr. Early appears to have been receiving a salary of \$1,500 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 \$2,215 are charged for contingent expenses of William T. Barry, late Minister to Spain. Now, sir, it is 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 United States.

There appears, also, to have been paid to John R. Clay, in 1836, \$3,381.41, 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 a year, and the payment to him of the further sum of \$2,381.41 may be justly questioned.

Other items, indicative of extravagance or 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 were mere forms, 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

amused, 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 a print or likeness of Gen. Washington, to be suspended in the Department, was questioned. 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, newspapers, made for this Department by its disbursing agent at home, there was expended in London, during last year, for similar objects, nearly \$500. A Librarian is employed, at a salary of \$1,540, 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 reasonable, 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 led charge of it, the blue book exhibited a list of dozen names, all under the head of clerks. One of these acted as translator for the Department, and his salary was \$1,150; another paid, out of the funds, and was charged with the contingent expense accounts, and he received \$1,150 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 \$1,700, a "Disbursing Agent," whose salary is \$1,500, a "Keeper of the Archives," whose salary is \$1,510, and gives one man \$900 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 the American 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 General Jackson, and now of Martin Van Buren, for almost every room in each of the Departments!

Mr. Speaker, during this "searching operation"—and capacious 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 labour; \$54 dollars for sundries; "16 dollars for work;" \$14 dollars for fuel; \$10 dollars for 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 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 forecast of the hard-money sub-Treasury system, by which, instead of transmitting the funds of the Government by means of the cheap, safe, and out-stating system of exchange, which prevailed before the banks were "debauched" by Mr. Kendall, the public money is now to be wagoned over the country at great expense and hazard, and always with delay.

The late eminent and virtuous Attorney-General, William Wirt, did not escape the censure of these indefatigable reformers. He had rendered some professional services, in which the United States were interested, but which were not such as his official station charged upon him. For this service an inconsiderable sum was paid to him, but its propriety was questioned. The salary of the Attorney-General was then 3,500 dollars, and he was allowed 800 dollars for a clerk. How stands the case now? The salary of Mr. Benjamin F. Butler, the present Attorney-General, is 4,000 dollars, and in 1834 he was paid \$4,150 for com-

ensation, besides being allowed 1300 dollars for a clerk and messenger, and 500 dollars for the contingent expenses of his office. The same additional allowance and charge, amounting together to 1,800 dollars, is made in 1835. Independent of the increased salary and the enlarged provision for a messenger, whence comes Mr. Butler's right to charge an excess of \$150 for compensation, besides 500 dollars for contingent expenses? In the year 1830 we heard nothing of contingent expenses, but a provision of 1,407 dollars is made for a clerk and messenger, and for Mr. Butler's compensation that year he received 4,332 dollars, when his salary was only 4,000 dollars. Why was this excess of 332 dollars paid him? He appears to have been used as a sort of *Caleb Quater*. He has been allowed to enjoy the salary of his own office and that of the Secretary of War at the same time, being at the rate of 10,000 per year, pursuing too his profession, and receiving its emoluments. No wonder we perceive in him "the complying law officer of the crown." When did he ever give an opinion contrary to the wish of the President, if he knew what was? Let me give an illustration. As the story is told, when the Baltimore railroad was about to be located at its termination in this city, the company consulted Mr. Butler on some point as to this right of way, under their charter. After full deliberation his professional opinion was obtained in writing. It happened that General Jackson felt some concern about the location of this right of way, and he expressed an opinion on the same point, respecting a termination of the road, which the company did not wish, and which Mr. Butler had advised, they need not adopt. Gen. Jackson was furnished with the opinion of the Attorney-General; but, instead of yielding, he endorsed on it, "Mr. Butler has not examined this case with his usual care; let this paper be referred back to him, with a copy of the charter for his re-examination." In due time, sir, the Attorney-General agrees with the President, and gives an opinion in conformity with that which Gen. Jackson had expressed! After this, Mr. Speaker, we need not be surprised at the absurd opinion of Mr. Butler, given as a foundation or justification for Gen. Jackson's circular, and which had passed both Houses of Congress almost by acclamation. Nor, indeed, should we be astonished at any opinion of his, unless he should have happened to give one different from what he supposed the President wanted.

I wish now, to make a few comments on the professions and practice of Mr. Amos Kendall, late Fourth Auditor, and now Postmaster General. This gentleman, you know, sir, was an eleventh-hour Jackson man. He, however, was among the first who got office; and immediately after his appointment, a letter of this is published, in which, after holding himself, and a few friends up as having been persecuted, he exclaims, "what has Heaven done? So disposed of events, as to make Barry Postmaster General, and myself a more humble Auditor." As to Mr. Barry, no matter "what events" made him Postmaster General, we know that under his management that department was deranged and rendered insolvent!

But now for this "humble Auditor," or, as from his own question, he is sometimes called, "this Heaven-born" Amos. If history does him justice, it will be found that he desired office under Mr. Clay, which, it not being in the power of the latter to provide, Mr. Kendall espoused the cause of General Jackson.

In this letter of Mr. Kendall, he says: "I feel bound by my obligations to my country, and by the pledges so often repeated by all the principal men of our party, to promote, with all my talents and industry, the reforms which the People demand. I will prove that our declarations have not been hollow pretences. Besides, I hold the interference of Federal officers with State politics to be improper in principle."

For the reform under this last paragraph, I refer you to Mr. Kendall's letters and toasts sent to various political meetings and dinners throughout the country, for a few years past, on the eve of State elections.

When Mr. Kendall entered upon the duties of his Auditor's office, he caused to be published in the United States, Telegraph, the then official organ, a letter, in which he says, "The interest of the country demands that this office shall be filled with men of business, and not with babbling politicians." Sir, the whole letter was the work of a babbling politician, expressly designed for political and demagogic ends, which the writer, in the same breath, said he had quit and left for others! I will read a few passages from it: "In five days before the returned to the post office twenty letters and three pamphlets, enclosed to the Fourth Auditor, and directed to other persons!" How long after this letter was it before Mr. Kendall, for the purpose of holding up the Globe newspaper, and the fortune of his friend Francis P. Blair, (another eleventh-hour Jackson man, whom he had brought from his former residence at Frankfort, Kentucky) sent under his frank to Kentucky, and perhaps elsewhere, the prospectus of this newspaper?

In that same letter Mr. Kendall also says: "Upon entering this office, on Monday last, one of the first objects which struck my eye was a pile of newspapers on my table. Among them, I counted sixteen different papers, all of which I was told were subscribed for by the Fourth Auditor, and paid for out of the Treasury."

He sent them back, as he then stated, with a note to each; of which the following is a copy:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
New York Office, March 24, 1820.

Sir: Not believing that I am authorized to charge the Government with subscriptions to newspapers and other publications, which are not useful to me in the discharge of my official duties; and not perceiving that I can derive any assistance from your journal in settling the accounts of the United States Navy, I have to request that you will discontinue sending it to this office. Very respectfully, your obedient servant.

AMOS KENDALL.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a fine display of the "pride, pomp, and circumstance" of official assistance. But yesterday he was himself the editor and publisher of a newspaper; he next appears, in his own language, an "humble Auditor." But sir, does not the letter just read show that he had forgotten his humility, and become puffed up with official consequence?

Why did he not simply tell his brother editors, in brief and respectful language, that he had discontinued the subscription for their paper?

But a further thought is suggested by this letter of Mr. Amos Kendall, and his reason for discontinuing newspaper subscriptions. He is now, sir, Postmaster General. Suppose we look at the statement of the contingent expenses of his office for the last year. Do you think we shall find any subscriptions for newspapers there "paid for out of the Treasury?" Listen to a few items:

Southern Literary Messenger,	\$10 00
New York Journal of Commerce,	10 00
Pennsylvania Democrat,	14 00
Pennsylvania,	8 00
Indian Biography,	4 00
Metropolitan Magazine,	4 00
3 Copies of the Daily Globe!!!	30 00
Richmond Enquirer,	5 00

Sundry others which I will not stop to name; the whole number being twenty or upwards, and the total of subscription within a small fraction of 200 dollars! He was frightened at a pile of 16 newspapers, but he can now take twenty at a dose! Can it be possible that a man, who came into office declaring, like the Pharisees of old, that "he was not like other men," and would even "tithe-mint and cummin," begins already to "neglect the weightier matters of the law?" What becomes of this inflated promise—"to prove" that his "declarations had not been hollow pretences?" Of what value was his declaration, made in his letter before referred to, and in which he says, "I am ready to prove to you, that the President has given me an opportunity to add him in proving that reform is not an empty sound, and is not to apply merely to the change of men?" Why, sir, I quote as a reply to these questions his own words, in another passage of his own letter: "The world will know him at last, and assign him his true rank." "Truth is omnipotent, and public justice certain."

Among Mr. Kendall's reforms may be mentioned his leading agency in the removal of the public deposits from the Bank of the United States. To effect this, he carried out a system of "bidding and cooing" with the State banks, and, in the language of a certain Senator, (Mr. Benton), "debauched them." "Yes, sir, debauched the word." I apply it to the Government and banks, though the Senator thought the People had been debauched, and applied it to them. For this work of "debauch," which proved so serious a curse to the country, this agent was employed thirty-two days, and was paid for this service the sum of \$310.11, being about ten dollars a day for a job which has occasioned much of the embarrassment under which the country now labors. He got 10 dollars a day for doing this injury to the Public—a hard-working laborer finds it difficult to get his dollar a day. But still, Mr. Kendall belongs to the "democratic party," and whilst he received his 10 dollars a day for that work, he also received the regular salary of his office. This appears to be an established usage of this Administration. The case of the Attorney-General is already mentioned. The reports from the Departments show several other cases, though I will now only add that of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who was for a while acting Secretary of War, and during this period drew the salaries of each office, being at the rate of 9,000 dollars a year.

But Mr. Speaker, no man better knows all the uses of office than Mr. Kendall. I have read a political tract, written, I think, by Dean Swift, entitled, somewhat in this way: "The convenience of a place at Court, or a sure mode of providing garments for a whole family." Mr. Kendall appears to understand the "*modus operandi*" of this matter. The printed list of clerks in this Department exhibits his father-in-law and two nephews, with salaries of 1,000, 1,300, and 1,400 dollars; and thus we see a family provision for nearly 10,000 dollars a year, including his own salary. But Mr. Kendall is not the only officer who thus takes care of his own household. If provision of this kind be evidence of "faith," few of them will be found "infidels." The President's son has an office, which I have already mentioned, of 1,500 a year. The Secretary of State's son, until very lately, held the place of District Attorney in Alabama. A near relation by marriage of the Secretary of the Treasury has a comfortable annuity of 1,400 in the Navy Department; another holds the appointment of naval officer in Boston, with a salary of 3,000 per year, besides being

President of the Lafayette Bank of that city; and a third is the Cashier of the Franklin Bank of that city, which became a special pet under the pet bank system. These gentlemen would all make excellent sub-Treasurers!

Mr. Bond said, when the proposition for retrenchment was under consideration here in 1828, the friends of Mr. Adams, by way of proving that he and they desired every just economy and reform, pointed to this message recommending it: "How were they answered? Why, sir, Mr. Ingham, who was soon afterwards made Secretary of the Treasury, said it was indeed true that the Message did recommend it, but he wanted to see more practice and less profession in this matter. There were no specified reforms found in the Message; he could only find there one of those formal recommendations, which were as unmeaning, he said, as the words 'your humble servant' at the foot of a letter. Mr. Randolph, in the same debate, used this language, on the subject of retrenchment and reform:

"The President did recommend them, in one of those lofty generalities with which all sermons, political or religious, abound; which might be printed in blank, like law process, and filled as occasions might require. But, sir, (said he) I am for looking at the practices; and not at the precepts of the person, political or religious."

Mr. Bond said this rule of Mr. Randolph was perfectly just; it was thus shown, too, to be avowed by this Administration, and he was willing to judge them by their own rule, and thought to this they ought not to object. He would leave it to the House, and to the People to say whether the "practices" of this Administration "had conformed to their precepts."

Was the recommendation in General Jackson's inaugural address one of those "lofty generalities" just spoken of, and defined by Mr. Randolph? The "Unit Cabinet" must have lost the art of reading, otherwise "reform" was not quite so "legibly" inscribed as the General imagined. The patronage of the Federal Government which was said to be brought into conflict with the freedom of State elections has greatly increased, and is still unrestrained, in the same conflict.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Bell) has for years labored to bring this House to the consideration of a bill to secure the freedom of elections, and thus carry into effect the recommendation of General Jackson's inaugural address. Able as that gentleman is, and untiring as he has been in his efforts, the measure proposed by him has received the frowns instead of the favor of this Administration. He and the venerable Senator from the same State (Mr. White) were the early and devoted friends of General Jackson, and they still desire to carry into practical effect the principles which they, with General Jackson, professed to be governed by. They feel and know the imminent danger which threatens the country, in the increased strength of the patronage of office. They see, and we all see, that the office-holders are "abroad in the land." For a description of this growing phalanx and its powerful influence to action, I will draw on high authority. A member of the Senate, (Mr. Grundy), a zealous friend of Gen. Jackson, the evidence of which has been already given in his own words, held this language, when aiming to pull down the old Administration: "When I see (said he) an office-holder interfering in elections, it occurred to me that he was thinking of his salary, and not, therefore, an unfit adviser of the People."

Mr. Speaker, that which occurred to Mr. Grundy no doubt often occurred to you at the same period. "The proposition is a very natural one; and I think that recent events have strengthened rather than impaired its truth. But I beg the further indulgence of the House while I read what another distinguished friend of General Jackson said, when debating the subject of retrenchment and reform on this floor. I allude to Mr. Buchanan, now a Senator from Pennsylvania, and, with his continued and growing devotion to the party, what he said will certainly be considered "orthodox." I find, by that debate, that he said it was well known,

"That when a man is once appointed to office, all the selfish passions of his nature are enlisted for the purpose of retaining it. The office-holders (said he) are the enlisted soldiers of that administration by which they are sustained. Their comfortable existence often depends upon the re-election of their patron. Nor does disappointment long rank in the hearts of the disappointed. Hope is still left to them; and bearing disappointment with patience they know will present a new claim to office."

"This passage of Mr. Buchanan's speech proves him to have been an observer of men and things, and familiar with the leading principles of human action. He judged the consequences of the selfish spirit of the office holder, and indeed the emptiness to believe that General Jackson and his friends would provide a suitable restraint upon it. But I fear, sir, that the People will be left to conclude that this gentleman is one of those 'political parsons' described by Mr. Randolph, whose 'practices' do not correspond with his 'precepts.' It is certain that, under the favorite Administration of the gentleman and his friends the effects, have received new life, instead of a check." But I must yet point out another discrepancy between Mr. Buchanan's present and practice. In the same debate he reviewed, with eagerness, several of the foreign missions that to Russia included,

HISTORY OF MAN.

FROM THE RUSSIAN.

What is man's history? Born—living—dying—Leaving the still shore for the troubled wave—Struggling with storms, winds—or shipwreck flying—And ending anchor in the silent grave.