The Star, and North-Carolina Gazette.

No. 25 RALEIGH, (N. C.) FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1824. Vol. XV

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

Subscription, three dollars per annum—No paper will be sent without at least $1 50 is paid in advance, and no paper discontinued, but at the option of the Editors, unless all arrearages are paid. Advertisements, not exceeding fifteen lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each continuance—All letters to the editors must be *post paid*.

MR. CRAWFORD—THE TARIFF.

Duties on articles of importation, recommended by Mr. Crawford in his Report to Congress of the 19th January, 1818.

Anvils, 2 cents per lb.
Axes, broad, 30 cents each
Narrow, 25 cents each
Hatchets, 15 cents each
Adzes, 25 cents each
Augurs, not exceeding half an inch, 1 1-2 cents each
Above that size, and not exceeding one inch, 2 cents each
Above an inch, and not exceeding 1 1-2 inches, 2 1-2 cents each
Above that size, 3 cents each
Chissels, not exceeding half an inch, 1 cent each
Above that size, and not exceeding 1 inch, 1 1-2 cents each
Above an inch, and not exceeding 1 1-2 inches, 2 cents each
Above that size, 2 1-2 cents each
Hammers, blacksmith's, 2 1-2, cents per lb.
Claw-hammers (carpenter's) 5 cents each
Hoes, broad, 12 cents each
Narrow, 10 cents each
Knives, courrier's, 40 cents each
Cutting, 25 cents each
Drawing, 25 cents each
Scyths, 25 cents each
Reaping hooks or sickles, 5 cents each
Rakes, 10 cents each
Saws, cross cut, $1 each
Whipsaw, $1 each
Handsaw, 25 cents each
Tennersaw, 20 cents each
Spades, 15 cents each
Andirons, cast iron, 1 cent per lb.
Wrought iron, 50 cents per pair
Brass, or of brass and any other metal, $2 per pair
Fenders, iron, $1 each
Of brass, or steel, or parts of either, $2 each
Shovels and tongs, iron, 30 cents per pair
Steel, or brass, or parts of either, 75 cents per pair
Muskets, $1 50 per stand
Rifles, $2 50 each
Fowling and hunting pieces, single barrel $4 each
Double barrel, $5 each
Cannon, cast iron, 2 cents per lb.
Brass, 5 cents per lb.
Frying pans, 25 cents per lb.
Gridirons and griddles, 20 cents each
Vessels, cast iron, not otherwise specified, 2 1-2 cents per lb.
Vessels, of copper, 10 cents per lb.
Of pewter, including dishes, plates, basons, tankards, spoons, and other utensils, not specified, 3 cents per lb.
Tin, in sheets or plates, 4 cents per lb.
Bandana, flag, and other silk handkerchiefs, from India, not exceeding 36 inches square, 15 cents
Above that size, 20 cents, each
Cotton bagging, 6 cents per yard
Drugs, aloes, 2 cents per pound
Ammoniacum, (gum) 4 cents per pound
Arabic, (gum) 2 cents per pound
Assafactida, (gum) 5 cents per pound
Sengal, (gum) 1 cent per pound
Guiacum, (gum) 2 cents per pound
Cream tartar, 1 cent per pound
Jalap, 3 cents per pound
Ipecacuanha, 10 cents per pound
Gloves or mits—long silk, $1 per doz.
Short, 60 cents per doz.
Children's 40 cents per doz.
Long cotton, 70 cts. per doz.
Short, 50 cents per doz.
Children's 30 cents per doz.
Hats, woolen or felt, men or women's, 20 cents each
Children's, 12 cents each
Beaver, men or women's, $1 each
Children's, 50 cents each
Hams, and other bacon, 3 cents per pound
Honey, 6 cents per gallon
Hair powder, 6 cents per pound
Horns—ox, 75 cents per 100
Horn tips, 50 cents per 100
Horse hair, 2 cents per pound
Leather, soal, 8 cents per pound
Dressed, 10 cents per pound
Lard, 2 cents per pound
Lemons, 25 cents per 100
Limes, 10 cents per 100
Liquorice, 2 cents per pound
Mahogany, 1 cent per c. foot
Madder, 1 cent per pound
Mustard, (except seed) 10 cents per pound
Nankeens, India short pieces, not exceeding seven yards, and eighteen inches in breadth, 25 cents per piece
India, long, not exceeding ten yards, and twenty-five inches in breadth, 40 cents per piece.

Pieces, exceeding these dimensions, the duty to be in proportion to the foregoing rates.

Oil—olive, in bottles, 40 cents per gallon.
Caster, 20 cents per gallon.
Linseed, 20 cents per gallon.
Olives, 50 cents per gallon.
Capers, 50 cents per gallon.
Oranges, 50 cents per 100.
Opium, 25 cents per pound.
Pickles, 10 cents per groce.
Pine apples, 2 cents each
Pipes—smoaking, 10 cents per groce
Prussian blue, 10 cents per pound
Preserves, comfits, and sweet meats, in sugar or brandy 10 cents per pound.
Quick silver, 5 cents per pound
Rice, 50 cents per 100
Rhubarb, 4 cents per pound
Saltpetre—refined, 2 cents per pound
Crude, 1 cent per pound
Sieves, 1 cent each
Saddle trees, 25 cents each
Snake root, 2 cents per pound
Saffron, 2 cents per pound
Senna, 3 cents per pound
Sarsaparella, 2 cents per pound
Stockings, silk, or where silk is the principal material, whole, $2 40 per doz
half ditto $1 20
quarter ditto 75 cts.
Cotton, wool, or flax, whole $1 50
half 80
quarter 35
Childrens—the duty upon the quarter respectively
Vitriol, 4 cents per pound
Umbrella or parasol, covered with silk $1
cotton 60 cts.
Sticks and frames 50
Wool—blankets, 20 cents per yard
carpets, inferior to Brussels, 25 cents
Brussels, and others, superior, 35 cents
flannels, or cotton mixtures, 12 cents

Legislature of North-Carolina.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

December, 1823.

DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S

ANTI-CAUCUS RESOLUTIONS.

[CONTINUED.]

Mr. IREDELL said, that until a late period of the Debate, he had intended to take no part in the discussion of these Resolutions. The reasons which produced this determination, and those which had subsequently induced him to change it, was alike unnecessary to state to the House. He would say, however, that he had been in some measure urged to the latter course by what he conceived to be the unfair manner in which these Resolutions had been treated by their opponents. When they were called up for discussion, the gentleman who introduced them, expressed his desire to amend them, by striking out the most exceptionable parts, and giving them such a form, as would bring before the House, simply and distinctly, the main question they were designed to present. All attempt at amendment, however, had been precluded by the motion for indefinite postponement, which had been made and persisted in by the gentlemen on the other side. And in the debate on this motion, while they deny all opportunity of striking out the parts admitted to be objectionable, they found their principal, and, certainly, their most solid arguments against the Resolutions on those very features. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, (said Mr. I.) that this course is inconsistent with parliamentary rules, but, with all the respect I sincerely entertain for the gentleman who have adopted it, I must think it is not consistent with that candor and urbanity which should distinguish our legislative proceedings. I admit, sir, that when a single Resolution contains but one distinct principle, a motion of this kind is usual, and is perfectly correct; but when two or more principles are involved in the same question, and the mover wishes to amend his proposition so as to bring one only before the House, it does not seem to me quite fair to deny the opportunity of presenting this principle alone, unincumbered with extraneous matter. If the question were now, sir, on the passage of these Resolutions as they stand, however strongly I approve of their main object, I should be compelled to vote against them myself, because there are some parts of the Preamble which I do not approve, and because they contain a principle to which I have never been able to bring myself to assent: I mean, the right of this Legislature to instruct our Senators and Representatives in Congress. But I shall vote against the postponement, in order that such amendments may be made as shall enable me most cheerfully to lend them my support. And, sir, I can assure the gentlemen, if this motion for indefinite postponement shall prevail, that a Resolution on the same subject, in a less objectionable shape, shall still be brought before the House. This kind of special pleading in legislation shall not avail them. The main question shall not be evaded. Those who are opposed to Caucus nominations, but disapprove of the present Resolutions, shall be afforded an opportunity of fairly expressing their opinions—and none shall be able to say, when rendering an account to their constituents, that they disapproved of Caucuses, but voted against these Resolutions on other grounds.

If, Mr. Speaker, I felt unwilling to intrude myself on the attention of the House in the discussion of the principal subject involved in these Resolutions, it did not proceed from any doubt as to its importance. I do believe the question now presented, to be one of high importance to the stability and purity of our Republican Institutions. Sir, let gentlemen disguise it as they will, let them cover it with as thick a veil of sophistry as they can, it is still a question between those who advocate the rights of the people, and those who believe the people incapable of exercising the most important of those rights. For, sir, if gentlemen say, as they do on this floor, that a Congressional Caucus is necessary to ensure a wise and prudent choice of a President, is it not declaring to the people, you are incapable of making this choice yourselves. We will therefore have a meeting of your Members of Congress to make it for you. Gentlemen may not chose openly to avow this doctrine; but, in my opinion, it is the inevitable result of their arguments in favor of a Caucus. If it is admitted that the people are competent of themselves, to exercise the power of election, why should they not be left to exercise it in the most free and unbiased manner? Mr. I. here referred to the parts of the Constitution of the U. S. which relate to the election of President and Vice-President, and insisted that according to its true intent, the right of election was vested in the first instance in the people—and though in the event of no person having a majority, the choice devolved on the House of Representatives, yet they were restricted to the three candidates who had received the highest number of votes. The House of Representatives thus restricted, could scarcely make a bad choice, or one much at variance with the wishes of a majority of the people.

It has been urged, Sir, (said Mr. I.) by the opponents of the Resolutions, that a Congressional Nomination of President and Vice-President, is not forbidden by the Constitution, and we have been called upon by the gentleman from Wake, with an air of triumph, to lay our finger on the clause of the Constitution which contains such a prohibition. I, sir, for one do not say, that there is any clause containing such express prohibition. But, *Qui hæret in litera, hæret in cortice*. I contend, that such a practice as these resolutions profess to condemn, is directly at war with the spirit and intention of the Constitution. I refer gentlemen to that excellent commentary on the Constitution, the Federalist, a work which is now the text book of all statesmen. I refer them to that, for I have not the book here to quote) for the reasons which induced the Convention to adopt the present mode of electing the executive, and the objections which presented themselves against any other mode of appointment. They wished above all things to keep this election pure; and they feared if it was entrusted to any pre-existing body, that body would be liable to be assailed by all the means of intrigue and corruption, which the prospect of so splendid and valuable a prize would tempt the ambitious aspirants and their warm partizans to employ. Gentlemen must wish for a Congressional nomination, because they believe it will have some influence in the election—otherwise it is perfectly nugatory. Now, sir, this influence may be greater or less, but just in proportion to its extent and power, in the same proportion will the reasons which induced the framers of our constitution to withhold from any pre-existing body the appointment of the executive, apply to a Congressional nomination with greater or less force—just in the same proportion will such a nomination be more or less at variance with the spirit of the Constitution. But gentlemen say, this power is necessary—that without it the people will be distracted, and will not know how to make a choice. If it is so, Sir, if the machinery of our Government cannot proceed without it, let it be engrafted into our constitution. If it must be a part of our political system in practice, let it be so too in theory—let it be inserted in our great political charter—let us know the form of government under which we live. Sir, I put gentlemen to the test—is there one in this House, is there one within the hearing of my voice, who would have the hardihood to propose as an amendment to the constitution, that the members of Congress, in caucus assembled, should have the power of nominating the President and Vice-President of the United States, and that no election should take place without such nomination. I challenge the most zealous of the new converts to the caucus system, to propose such an amendment. Sir, they dare not do it. They know that the frowns of an indignant people would put them down. And why attempt to seize by artifice, by subtlety, a power which they dare not openly ask for? But it is said, the members do not meet in Caucus as members of Congress, but as individuals. Mr. speaker, I ask, in the name of common sense, if this can make any real difference? The members of Congress are excluded from electing in the first instance, because they are a body of men in existence sometime before the election, and therefore liable to be tampered with? If their nomination is to have a powerful, an overbearing influence on the election, is there not as great danger of their integrity being exposed to temptation? They meet in Caucus because they are members of Congress—they are the same individuals who compose the Congress. Can it make any real difference as to the danger to our liberties, as to their exposure to intrigue and corruption, whether they meet in one room or another; whether they clothe their proceedings with Legislative forms or not; whether Mr. Clay presides over them as Speaker, or some other member as Chairman? They are still the same body of men whom the Constitution has excluded from the election in the first instance, to whom, from their political situation and their pre-existence as a body, it was thought dangerous to intrust such a power. In my opinion, Sir, the distinction exists merely in name and appearance—it has no foundation in reality.

Again, sir, it is said the nomination by members of Congress is but a recommendation, and can have no binding influence on the people. Mr. Speaker, I detest all mere verbal distinctions—Let us go to the substance. And I appeal to the candor of the gentlemen on the other side, whether they do not believe such a nomination will have a great and important influence on the election? Whether it would not have the effect of procuring a majority for the person so nominated, when, without it, such majority could not be obtained? Whether they do not expect such a result from a caucus nomination, and whether that is not the reason why they so strenuously advocate one? Sir, I know they must answer in the affirmative. Indeed, sir, the gentleman from Wake has told us, (though I disclaim the application of the remark to myself) that this question is only a struggle between the friends of the different candidates—that he is anxious for a caucus, because he believes his favorite candidate has a majority. Does he mean a majority of the people? No, sir, for if he did, he could not be so anxious for a caucus. If his candidate has a majority of the people already in his favor, he wants nothing more to ensure his election. A caucus would be entirely unnecessary. No, sir, it is because he knows the candidate whose cause he espouses has not a majority of the people, and believes he may have a majority in a Congressional caucus, that he is so anxious on this subject.

Again, Sir, we are told by Gentlemen on the other side, some of whom have talked so loudly about Republicanism and Democracy, that if we do not permit the Members of Congress to make a nomination, the people are so ignorant, they will never be able to select a fit man for President. Mr. Speaker, I have ever been the friend of the people, but never their flatterer. I have never deceived them by caresses, nor courted them for popularity. But I am, and always have been, the advocate of their just rights, more especially of the rights secured to them by the constitution and laws of the country. Sir, it is a sufficient answer to this objection of incompetency, to say, the constitution has thought them competent and has entrusted them with the power, and it was done so for the wisest reasons. The framers of that instrument knew that there would, at all times, be individuals in the community gifted with higher talents and possessing more intelligence than the great mass of the people, but they knew, too, that while a few men might be seduced, the people were incorruptible. The power exercised by them would be exercised in purity. But, Sir, I deny the proposition of the Gentlemen. The great body of the people are not only incorruptible—they are intelligent. They are capable of deciding for themselves among the candidates for the Chief Magistracy. The Gentlemen ask, how are the people to obtain the necessary information? they have no personal acquaintance with the candidates, and must therefore be governed either by the opinions of newspaper Editors, or the recommendation of Members of Congress. Sir, do the Gentlemen really think, that a personal acquaintance is absolutely necessary to enable us to judge of the merits of the individual presented to our choice? Is his fitness for this high office to be estimated by his personal appearance, his graceful carriage, his colloquial powers, or his agreeable and insinuating manners? No, Sir, I can tell the gentlemen of another source from which, in my apprehension, the information to guide us on this subject should be derived—the source from which I have form my opinion—a source which is equally accessible to the whole community. It is the history—the public records of our country. Here you can find the proofs of the pure and elevated patriotism, of the devotion to his country's cause, of the correct political sentiments, of the firmness and independence of character, of the highly gifted mind and the eminent public services which should alone entitle an individual to the highest political honor which one man can receive from his fellow-men. He who cannot appeal to public testimonials of his superior merits, who cannot produce these passports to office, may, it is true, Sir, attach to himself a number of warm partizans, forming their predilection from their personal acquaintance and intimate association with him, and by their means may possibly secure a majority in a Congressional Caucus. But such a man ought never to present a claim for the highest office in the nation. Such a man, unless assisted by a Caucus, can never receive the votes of an enlightened people. If the candidates have been in public life (and none other will ever presume to aspire to this office) the people will enquire, and the means of ascertaining are open to them, what have been their public services, and what eminent talents have they exhibited? If the people are left unbiased by unauthorized associations, bearing with them the stamp of official influence, this is the criterion to which they will bring all the candidates—a criterion on which they are as capable of deciding as the members of Congress.

Gentlemen have urged another argument in favor of a Caucus that it will prevent the sitting from going to the House of Representatives. I ask, is this correct—if it is strictly honest? The Constitution has provided that, in the event of a majority of the electors not agreeing upon a President and Vice President, the choice shall devolve on the House of Representatives, where each State will be entitled to one vote. This provission was the result of compromise, of that system of mutual concessions between the large and small States on which our Constitution was founded. I admit, sir, that in this particular an undue influence is given to the small states; but they have given an equivalent for it to the large states, in yielding to them, in other respects, a greater share of power. It is a bargain—a contract between the large and small states. Is it just in us, while we continue to enjoy the equivalent, to deprive them of the privileges for which it was rendered? Is it honest in us, Sir, while we avail ourselves of all the advantages secured to us by the contract, to evade the performance of the part made for their benefit, because we may think it presses rather hardly upon us? Is it right, sworn as we are to support the whole Constitution, to endeavor by indirect means to defeat any of its provisions? If this provision is unjust, or impolitic, it is in the power of the nation to strike it out; but while it exists, we are as much bound, as patriots and as honest men, to support it in its true spirit, as we are any other parts of the constitution which may be more agreeable to our interests.

But, sir, we are warned to take care, lest, while we are charging members of Congress with an assumption of power, we should ourselves transgress our legitimate and prescribed bounds, by expressing an opinion on this subject. On this part of the argument, Mr. Speaker, I will only refer gentlemen to the practice not only of this Legislature, but, I believe, of every Legislature in the Union since the foundation of our government. Have they not repeatedly expressed opinions on important public subjects, which did not come immediately whithin the sphere of their legislative functions? (Mr. I. here mentioned some instances of this kind.) And, sir, if we believe the practice, which these resolutions profess to condemn, to be a dangerous invasion of the rights of the people—an infringement of the spirit of the Constitution—is it not peculiarly our duty to express our opinion, to warn the people of the danger, and to endeavor, by denouncing, to suppress it?

Mr. Speaker, I ask pardon of the House for having detained them so long with these desultory and unpremeditated remarks. I am, sir, no political aspirant. I have no hope, if I had any wish, of political preferment. I came here with reluctance, and shall rejoice when the day of my departure arrives. But, sir, I am one of the people and deeply interested in the maintainance of their privileges and their power. In whatever situation I may be placed, I am determined, by every effort I can command, to oppose any attempted invasion of their rights. They may find, sir, more able defenders—but they will never find one more zealous or more faithful.

MR. WILLIAMS'S CIRCULAR.

To the Editors of the Star.

GENTLEMEN—The practice of writing Circulars by Members of Congress to their constituents, is one not to be censured, if followed in the spirit in which they are generally pretended to be written; but when they are made the vehicles of misrepresentation, and of party electioneering, they are contemptible, and ought to be treated as such by a free people. Of this description, I conceive is the Circular of Mr. Lewis Williams, lately published in the Register.

Mr. Williams professes to give his constituents a narrative of the proceedings of Congress. Such a narrative would have contained a long list of decisions upon the most prominent subjects acted upon in Congress; but, instead of this, his constituents are bored with a few party questions, several of minor importance; and a vaporing display of Radical patriotism is made from them, calculated to excite party feelings, and mislead the reader.

The first subject of this circular, is the proposition discussed in the House of Representatives for sending a Government agent to Greece; a measure perfectly free from any cause either of war or complaint from other nations, according to the usages of nations; although it might be a cause of some secret jealousy on the part of the Kings of the old world. But what could this measure have added to the jealousy already known to exist with them against the acts of all free governments? Mr. Williams, however, magnifies the merit of being opposed to the proposition, by conjuring up an image of raw-head and bloody bones; and represents himself as a knowing statesman, who perceives the dangers of imprudence at a distance beyond the moon. If Mr. Williams had simply remarked, that, all things considered, he thought this measure as well let alone, at least for a time, he would have shewn more wisdom; and, for one, I would have joined him in the sentiment.

The next subject which Mr. W. notices, is the resolution respecting the Spanish colonies in America. This resolution was simply laid upon the table of the House, and never afterwards acted upon; so that it never called forth the sentiments of Congress, and is, therefore, utterly unimportant as an item in the proceedings thereof. But it was necessary for Mr. W. to call it into view, in order to make a greater swell of windy patriotism.

Then comes a [illegible] money matters of the nation. Here Mr. W. considers himself at home. His theme has long been "save money." Very good; and what fool does not say so. But if saving money is all that is requisite for Members of Congress to attend to, they might as well stay at home, save to the people the wages paid, and all other expenditures of Government. But, Mr. W. would make the people believe, that, if such politicians as himself had the sole management, great things would be done in the saving way. There are wiser men than Mr. W. who are firmly convinced, that if such politicians as himself were always attended to, we should stand, as a nation, the sport and prey of those "continental powers," of whom he seems to stand in so much dread. Mr. W. neither gives a very clear nor very true account of the real state of our financial concerns; and as to the savings that might have been made, the history of the last twelve years shews, that the measures pursued by such politicians as Mr. W. threw the whole system of our finances into confusion, prostrated our credit, paralized all our efforts, and left the nation to be redeemed by the individual sacrifices and personal bravery of such men as *Thompkins*, *Monroe* and *Jackson*. They have resisted necessary expenses of a few thousands, the want of which has injured the nation millions. They are too contracted in their views to pursue measures of necessary policy, from the neglect of which embarrassment and distress have arisen, where abundance and confidence ought to have prevailed.

After this parade of revenue transactions, Mr. W. holds up that great undescribed, indescribable monster, the *Tariff*. It is a creature, he would tell us, bred to the North; something, we may suppose, like the *sea-serpent*, so celebrated in Yankee story; but is of very lengthened dimensions; for it reaches from the North to the South, and, with its tail, draws the money out of the pockets of the Southerners! It is such romance as this that is to bolster the popularity of our wise legislators. If Mr. W. had recurred to former times, and recollected the indignation awakened in the people by the conduct of the Hartford Convention, who talked of resisting Southern policy during the war, he might have seen how odious must be such threatening language as he has used on this topic. He has only ranted, not reasoned; and I will give an answer to all his misrepresentations

[See 4th Page.]