

THE STAR, and North-Carolina Gazette, Published weekly by BELL & LAWRENCE.

Subscription, three dollars per annum... All letters to the editors must be post paid.

Mr. EDWARDS' ADDRESS.

I will now submit to your honorable body a few remarks, to show that the negative statements of Mr. Crawford, and his officers of the Treasury Department, however confidently relied upon by him for my total overthrow, are too inconclusive for his purpose.

You have been informed by him, that, previous to the issue of his correspondence with the local banks, which were made the depositories of public money, it had been usual to refer all such calls to Mr. Jones, his chief clerk, but that, in these cases, another clerk had been selected to collect the letters, &c. which were called for. Why this change was made, at that particular juncture, (being wholly unaccounted for by Mr. Crawford,) is left to conjecture.

This is substantially, 1st. That no such letter from the Receiver [as that mentioned in my examination] is to be found in the files of the Department. 2. That the officers employed in it have no recollection of the receipt of such a letter. And 3. That the records of the Department do not show that it was answered.

Supposing it to be true, that this letter cannot be found "in the files of the Department," it by no means proves that it was not received by Mr. Crawford.

This is not the first occasion on which I have had to regret that a letter received by him could not be found, when it became necessary for my defence.

Finding myself grossly misrepresented in relation to a letter I had written to him, and being determined to vindicate myself against the insinuations that were predicated upon it, I wrote to him on the 5th Jan. 1821, requesting a copy of it. In his reply dated 10th January, 1821, he says, "The letter which you have described in yours of the 3th instant, has been sought for in vain. Mr. Jones states that, according to the best of his recollection, he considered it not of a description to go on the files, and that consequently it was not filed. If his recollection is correct, it accounts for the absence of the letter from the files, and for its being lost or mislaid."

My letter being thus disposed of, Mr. Crawford, in his answer, impliedly repeated one of the insinuations above referred to. This was promptly repelled by me; and since then, I have heard no more on that subject. From this case alone, it might not be unreasonable to presume that some similar disposition may have been made of the letter now in question. But, with every motive to make such an assertion, Mr. Crawford has not ventured to say he did not receive this letter. It will not be difficult to shew that other letters, of infinitely more importance, have been received by him, about which, it might be truly said, "no such letters are to be found in the files of the Department." He has sometimes another depository for them, in which the letter mentioned in my examination may also have been placed. It may have been addressed to him "without the addition of Secretary of the Treasury," which we have seen gravely insisted on as giving him a right to consider any letter as "a private paper," though exclusively relating to matters of official duty. Or he may have "considered it not of a description to go on the files," and thus may "its absence from the files," or "its being lost or mislaid," be very naturally accounted for, according to the practice of the Department.

The probability of this supposition is greatly strengthened by the following case:

Between 1816 and the 31st December, 1819, he received important communications on the subject of the illicit introduction of a large number of African slaves into the United States, which strongly implicated one of his particular friends. By a resolution of the House of Representatives, of the last mentioned date, he was directed to lay before the House copies of such communications as he had received since 1816, and such information as he possessed, in relation to the illicit introduction of slaves into the United States. But, notwithstanding this positive call upon him, I assert, and I challenge investigation, that he did withhold letters and information upon this subject, implicating his friend, which ought to have been communicated to the House, and some of which, he did not even permit "to go on the files of the Department."

Of course, it might be very truly said of them, "that no such letters are to be found on the files of the Department; and that the officers employed in it have no recollection of the receipt of them;" for, having been deposited in his own private bureau, those officers could have no means of ascertaining the fact, and the very motives for withholding them from the files, would render fruitless all attempts to find "answers" to them. An examination of the records of the Department, and yet, there is no doubt of their having been received, and the strongest probability that they were answered also. If the authority of the House of Representatives was not sufficient to obtain their production, the non-production of the letter of the Receiver at Edwarsville ought not to excite a moment's surprise.

But, it also appears that he, and his officers of the Treasury Department, have not been able to find a great number of other letters, and even some of his own official ones, when required by other calls of the House, or, if they could have been found, they were suppressed.

Of this, the documents furnished by himself afford both abundant and conclusive proof. Many instances might be stated. For the sake of brevity, I will allude to a few of them only. Several cases of this kind are presented by the correspondence with the Bank of Huntsville. I will refer to but one of them. This is too conclusive for any artifice to elude it, and it requires but a bare inspection of the documents themselves to be convinced of it.

In his letter L. No. 7, to the President of the Bank of Huntsville, dated the 30th July, 1819, he says, "You will perceive, by the contents of MY LETTER OF THE 9th INSTANT, that the failure of the Nalville Bank, and its offices, was, at that time, known to this Department. It was then foreseen that the Bank of Huntsville could not fail to be injuriously affected by that event, and by others of a similar nature, which were then anticipated."

The reasons stated in MY LETTER OF THE 9th INSTANT, in favour of the prompt adoption, by the bank, of the measures necessary to the transfer of the public money in the possession of the bank, beyond the permanent deposits, remain unimpaired. This letter, of the 9th July, 1819, is also referred to in letter L. No. 8, from the President of the Bank of Huntsville, dated September, 1819. Yet this same LETTER OF THE 9th INSTANT, whose "relevance to the subject matter of the call" admits of no question, "was not to be found on the files of the department," or it was purposely suppressed, for it has not been communicated.

By an examination of the documents No. 66 and No. 119, it will be seen that more than half the correspondence with the Bank of Missouri, though called for by a resolution of the House, had been suppressed. The importance and very delicate import of a few of these letters, will be noticed presently, in connection with another subject. But, though there were two calls in this case, either of which rendered it the duty of Mr. Crawford to have transmitted all the correspondence; and though, in answering the second call, he expressly stated that he had transmitted "all the correspondence required by the resolution, except two letters from the Receiver at St. Louis, which were of a confidential nature," yet, your honorable body will find very strong reasons to doubt the correctness of this statement, and I shall be much surprised if the third call, with which he has so tardily complied, has been sufficient to draw from him all the correspondence, even with the Bank of Missouri. The omission of letters, addressed to the department, might be accounted for on the supposition that they might have miscarried. But this is a casualty to which the letters, or copies of the letters of the Secretary himself, which should always remain in the department, are not liable. They may however, sometimes disappear, as the letter of the Receiver at Edwarsville seems to have done. If not, it will be difficult to account for the absence of a letter of the 30th July, 1819, which is presumed to have been addressed by Mr. Crawford to the Bank of Missouri, upon the authority of a report of a committee of the Legislature of Missouri, at its session in 1822.

This was a committee appointed to examine into the concerns of the Bank of Missouri. Mr. Crawford's letters to that bank were submitted to the inspection of the committee, and the report, which I have the honor herewith to transmit, (11) contains extracts from several of them, among which is one from his letter of 30th July, 1819, of which enough appears to prove that it was embraced by the call, and ought to have been communicated, unless, indeed, it is a mere fabrication by the committee, for which no imaginable motive can be perceived.

I have not time to dwell upon several curious particulars that are disclosed by this report. I beg leave, however, to refer your honorable body to the contract with the Bank of Missouri, as therein set forth. An inspection of it will enable you to decide at once whether it is correctly represented in Mr. Crawford's report of it, and whether he had a right to withdraw any part of the permanent deposit, under any pretence whatever, before the expiration of six months "after it ceased to be employed to receive the public moneys."

In regard to the letters that have been alluded to, I will barely remark, that, if so many of them, actually belonging to the Department, could not be found on "its files," it will not be strange if it shall hereafter appear that the letter of the Receiver, at Edwarsville, has been overlooked; or, if the former were purposely suppressed, there is nothing improbable in the belief that the latter has shared the same fate.

But this letter may have been received by Mr. Crawford, and he may have forgotten it. This, I presume, I may fairly demonstrate, by shewing that his memory has been extremely treacherous, in other instances, of far greater consequence. For this purpose, I beg leave, in the first place, to call the attention of your honorable body to his oath, before the committee.

Regardless of the salutary admonitions of the proverb "of the glass windows," he has treated my oath somewhat freely, and he can have no reasonable cause to complain if his own shall undergo a slight investigation. On his examination before the Committee, he says, "I never sanctioned the omission of ANY PART of the correspondence."

Now let us hear Mr. Dickens, his confidential clerk. On the examination of this gentleman before the same Committee, he says, "It is the general direction of the Secretary, when information is called for, to give every thing that relates to the subject. When the call was made, I looked over all the papers, filed and unfiled, relating to the subject. The papers, after selection, are laid before the Secretary; and in this case, he directed me to collect every thing in the office relating to the subject. They were selected and submitted to his inspection. In this case, from the urgency of it,

I took the original and rough drafts. The papers remained some time before the Secretary, while he was making the report, after I gave them to him, and before he communicated to the House."

Let it be recollected that Mr. Dickens is one of Mr. Crawford's witnesses against me, and enjoys his highest confidence. Now, if this gentleman swears the truth, I would ask, how it could have happened that so many letters of the correspondence with the Banks of Huntsville and Missouri alone, were suppressed, without Mr. Crawford's sanction?

The document, No. 119, before referred to, most indisputably proves that upwards of twenty letters of the correspondence with the latter bank were suppressed, on the first call for them; and that these very letters were "in the office." If, then, Mr. Dickens did collect, and lay before Mr. Crawford, "all the papers, filed and unfiled, relating to the subject," which he was so strictly ordered to do, and swears he did; by whom could the suppression of so great a portion of the correspondence with the Bank of Missouri have been effected? If not by Mr. Crawford, his own statement shews that it must have been done by Mr. Dickens. To permit so flagrant a breach of trust and confidence to pass with impunity, is to sanction it. If this suppression escaped Mr. Crawford's notice, when he answered the first call for those letters, he could not have been ignorant of it, when he shortly afterwards complied with the second call, by transmitting the very letters that had been suppressed. Yet we have never heard that Mr. Dickens has been punished, in any manner whatever; and from the relation in which these gentlemen stand to each other, it cannot be presumed that he has been even blamed.

Again: Mr. Crawford, in his testimony, says, "It is usual when resolutions require information which the records or files of the office afford, to send copies; but when there is a press of business, the ORIGINALS are sometimes sent, as in the present case." Thus, it appears, from the oaths of these two gentlemen, that Mr. Dickens delivered all the "originals and rough drafts" to Mr. Crawford; and that the latter sent them all to the House. No other could reasonably expect to find COPIES among them. Yet, upon an examination of the correspondence with the Huntsville Bank alone, it will be found that about one third of the pages it occupies, and more than that proportion of the letters, are given as EXTRACTS. These, surely, cannot be ORIGINALS, unless Mr. Crawford and the President of the Bank of Huntsville were in the habit of sending EXTRACTS of their own letters to each other—a novelty that can scarcely be believed to have occurred.

But, besides the striking variance between Mr. Crawford's statement, of having sent the originals to the House, and the fact of this case, the transformation of those originals into extracts, requires explanation, at least. It is difficult to conjecture any motive for sending these extracts, instead of the originals, unless, it was for the purpose of omitting and withholding something which the latter contained; and if Mr. Crawford "never sanctioned the omission of ANY PART of the correspondence," by whom, & with what motives, could these extracts have been made, and foisted into the place of the originals?

It cannot be too much to say that there appears to have been considerable forgetfulness in some part of this affair. Mr. Crawford must also have forgotten the resolution of 1816, when, in direct violation of its positive injunctions, he received from certain local banks, in discharge of their debts to the United States, and at par, the large amount of uncurrent notes, which, in his report, he admits he did receive from them. But his memory must have been much more unfortunately treacherous to him, in two other particulars, relating to this business; for, I shall show that he has made two palpable and important mistakes in regard to it.

Being called on by a resolution of the House of Representatives to state the amount of uncurrent paper, which he received from the local banks, that had been made depositories of public money, received from the sale of public lands, he admits the receipt of a large amount from the Banks of Edwarsville, Missouri, and Tombeckee. But, as an excuse for his conduct, he represents those notes to have been deposited in these banks "before the date of their contracts," under which they agreed to account for the public deposits as specie.

This I do most unequivocally and positively aver to be a misrepresentation and an indefensible apology, and your honorable body cannot fail to be convinced of it, by adverting to the contracts themselves. I will refer to only one of them at present. The very first article of the contract with the Bank of Edwarsville, under which it received the first cent of public deposits, is in the following words, viz: "1st. That the public moneys shall be entered to the credit of the Treasurer as cash," which may be seen in document No. 66, letter G. No. 1 and 2.

But, for his own opinion upon the subject, even in a case where there had been no express stipulation "to pay cash," I refer your honorable body to his letter L. No. 1, to the President of the Bank of Huntsville, dated 11th January, 1818, where it will be found that he says, "In making the Planters and Merchants' Bank of Huntsville a place of deposit, at its particular solicitation, it was expected that the transfer of the funds which it undertook to make, would be effected in funds that circulated at par at the place where the transfer was directed. As the Receiver had been directed to receive the bills on no banks which did not discharge them in specie upon demand, it was expected that the bank would be answerable for the amount deposited in specie, or in bills which would be received as specie, at the place to which the money should be directed to be transferred, unless it should state the contrary."

But this is not the worst case; he has, in the same report, misstated the amount of uncurrent notes, which he did receive from those banks, making it much less than it actually was; and some of the suppressed letters in the correspondence with the Bank of Missouri will prove it. This statement, no doubt, will surprise and astonish your honorable body; but, you will

not long regard it as a proof of temerity. I shall, however, content myself with barely stating enough to carry reasonable conviction to your own minds of the truth of it. None shall doubt, who will either read or hear the testimony exhibited to you by Mr. Crawford himself.

The suppressed letters B. No. 13, from the President of the Bank of Missouri, dated 11th October, 1819, and B. No. 19, from Thomas Redick, agent of that bank, dated 19th February, 1820, taken in connection with Mr. Crawford's settlement with the said agent, will prove that the sum of \$1,175, which he (Mr. Crawford) received from that bank, though artfully stated so as to disguise the fact, was composed of \$200 of notes on the Franklin Bank of Alexandria, and \$885 on the Mechanics' Bank of Alexandria.

His own suppressed letter B. No. 7, dated 29th May, 1819, contains a notification to the bank of Missouri, of the failure of the former of these banks. And a friend has furnished me with the following extract from the files of the National Intelligencer in regard to the latter, viz: "August 28th, 1819. The Mechanics' Bank of Alexandria does not redeem its notes in specie, and its notes no longer pass here currently."

The suppressed letters, B. No. 25, from himself to the President of the Bank of Missouri, dated 14th November, 1820, and the President's answer B. No. 26, dated 12th Dec. 1820, will show that he received from that bank \$40,136, in notes on the Bank of Tennessee, and its branches, which were deposited in the Branch of the U. States' Bank at Louisville, on the 21st of May, 1820, to meet the Treasurer's draft.

A report from Luke Lea, Pension Agent at Knoxville, to J. L. Edwards, of the Pension Office, dated 27th Jan. 1823, shows that these notes were "mostly on the branches of the Knoxville bank."

I have in my possession proof that those branches stopped payment in the summer of 1819, but I deem it unnecessary to exhibit it, as every member of the delegation in Congress, from Tennessee, as well as other members of Congress, must know that they had failed to redeem their notes in specie, long before the notes in question were received by Mr. Crawford. It is only necessary to add, that none of these notes are included in the amount of uncurrent notes reported by Mr. Crawford.

Now, though the probability that these misstatements were innocently made, is somewhat weakened by the suppression of the letters that would have detected their inaccuracies, I do not deem it necessary to insist that they prove any thing more than a greater degree of forgetfulness and inadvertence, than to have forgot or overlooked such a trifling affair as the letter mentioned in my examination. If they were intentional, it would prove the statement made against me so much the less entitled to credit.

In making deposits in the local Banks of Louisville, Cincinnati, Chillicothe, and of the District of Columbia, (in all of which places Branches of the Bank of the United States were established,) and, in some instances, continuing those deposits for years in succession, without making any report thereof to Congress, Mr. Crawford must have forgot for a very long time, indeed, and on a great variety of occasions, both the letter and intention of the following section in the law establishing the Bank of the United States, viz: "Be it enacted, &c. That the deposits of the money of the United States in places in which the said Bank or Branches thereof may be established, shall be made in said Bank or Branches thereof, unless the Secretary of the Treasury shall, at any time, otherwise order and direct; in which case the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately lay before Congress, if in session, and if not, immediately after the commencement of the next session, the reasons of such order or direction."

Indeed, I am under the impression that, notwithstanding his compliance with the above requisition, on the 10th December, 1817, which proved that it was then fresh in his recollection, and though his connection with the Bank of the United States, its pressing wants, and the nature of the business he had to transact with it, were all calculated to recal his attention to that part of his duty, almost every day, he himself has, in some one of his reports admitted that he had overlooked it through "mere inadvertence."

I regret to have to say to your honorable body, that both the state of my health, and the want of time, absolutely compel me, most reluctantly, to close this investigation of Mr. Crawford's well-aimed statement against me. In this situation, I beg leave to refer you, for further facts, of which I might, under more favorable circumstances, fairly and successfully avail myself to a few of the publications under the signature of "A. B.," herewith transmitted.

Avowing myself the author of these publications, and, with the exception of a few unimportant typographical errors, and a mere verbal inaccuracy in regard to the time of a certain report's being made, re-asserting, before your honorable body, and the nation, that the facts they allege are substantially true, I do most respectfully solicit that they may be taken as a part of, and be printed with, this communication. In order to strengthen my claim to this indulgence, combining all the rights of defence, of accusation, and of asking for investigation, which can entitle me, as a citizen of the United States, or an officer of their government, to appear before your honorable body, I do expressly state:

- 1. That the Honorable William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury, has mismanaged the national funds.
2. That he has received a large amount of uncurrent notes from certain banks, in part discharge of their debts to the United States, contrary to the resolution of Congress of 1816.
3. That, being called on by a resolution of the House of Representatives to state the amount of uncurrent notes which he received from these banks, he has misstated it, making it less than it really was.
4. That he has, in his report to the House, misrepresented the obligations of those banks, or some one of them, at least, and predicated thereon an indefensible excuse for his conduct in receiving those uncurrent notes.
5. That he has acted illegally, in a variety of instances, by making and continuing deposits of public money in certain local banks,

without making report thereof to Congress, according to law; and

6. That he has, in several instances, withheld information and letters, called for by the House, and which it was his duty to have communicated.

His Oath.—Let it speak for itself. For specifications of these statements, I offer the publications under the signature of A. B. above mentioned, and this communication; and, for proof, I offer that which they respectively refer to.

All this I do defensively; for, if the facts stated be true, no rational man can doubt that they must weaken, at least, the force of Mr. Crawford's statement against me.

I will not charge him with bad intentions in any of those acts. It is more properly the duty of others to inquire into and judge of that matter. I do not ask for an investigation more naturally to be looked for from himself. But I will say, that, if being an officer of the same government under which he holds his office, I have wilfully and maliciously misrepresented him, in the six foregoing allegations, it is a misdemeanor that would prove me unworthy of the office I hold. I invite him, or any of his friends, to make this charge against me, pledging myself to waive all notice, and, with all the disadvantages of absence, to submit to an investigation thereof by either or both House of Congress, and to abide by the decision thereupon. If this proposition is declined, I trust we shall have no more canting about an "A. B. plot." As to myself, I fear not the consequences of any fair investigation, for I know I shall be able, whatever may be the result, to justify myself to the nation. And never having obtained any office by the slightest sacrifice of independence; I never will owe the holding of one to reluctant forbearance, or the courtesy of my enemies.

I will only add, that, if any attempt should hereafter be made, wantonly to take advantage of my absence, by those who have forbore to attack me when I could have had an opportunity of defending myself, I must beg of your honorable body, and the nation, to suspend your opinions, and to be assured that there shall be no avoidable delay in vindicating myself. I have in reserve much matter of defensive accusation, and should most certainly have invited your attention to the report concerning the Receiver of public moneys at Huntsville, and other matters of not less importance, had time permitted.

NINIAN EDWARDS.

Wheatings, Va. April 6, 1824.

CONGRESS.

SENATE.

Saturday, May 1.

THE TARIFF.

The bill from the House of Representatives, "to amend the several acts for imposing duties on imports," was again taken up for consideration, in committee of the whole.

Just previous to the bill being ordered to lie on the table, yesterday, Mr. Holmes, of Maine, had moved to amend it, by excepting "Russia, Holland, and Ravens Duck, and Russia Sheetings," from the duty of 25 per cent. levied on other cotton, silk, flax, or hempen fabrics; and Mr. Barbour had moved to amend the amendment, by adding to it, as another exception, "German linens."

Mr. Barbour now varied his motion, by withdrawing the words "German linens," and proposing to add to the exceptions, "Danzburgs, Tickenburgs, and Burlaps."

The question upon amending the amendment, as proposed by Mr. Barbour, was put, and decided in the negative—Yeas 23, Nays 24.

The question was then upon amending the bill, so as to except "Russia Duck, Holland, Ravens Duck, and Russia Sheetings," from the duty of twenty-five per cent. which it is contemplated to impose on manufactures of cotton, silk, flax, or hemp. Mr. Lloyd of Mass. advocated this amendment. Mr. Barbour then moved an adjournment, and the Senate adjourned.

Monday, May 3.

Mr. Jackson, from the joint committee appointed to consider what business is necessary to be acted on, at the present session of Congress, and at what time the session may be closed, submitted their final report on that subject; stating that, in the opinion of the Committee, the session of Congress may be terminated on the 19th instant. The report was laid upon the table.

Mr. Barton, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported, without amendment, the bill, which originated in Senate, "to enable the President to sell and dispose of the refuse lands of the United States." Mr. Barton, the Chairman of the Committee, stated, that the committee believed the system proposed in this bill, incompatible with the full and fair execution of the present system of raising revenue from the public lands, for the discharge of our national debt; as the promulgation of the system now proposed, would have the effect of preventing public sales and private sales at the present minimum price; for few would buy now, when, by waiting a few years, they might get the lands at 50 cents per acre. However proper the proposed plan might become hereafter, the committee deemed it premature and improper at this time; and had, therefore, instructed him to move the indefi-