

## THE STAR,

And North Carolina Gazette,

Published weekly, by

BELL & LAWRENCE.

Subscription, three dollars per annum. No paper will be sent without at least \$1.00 paid in advance, and no paper discontinued, but at the option of the Editors, unless all arrears are paid. Advertisements, not exceeding five lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each continuation. All letters to the Editors must be post paid.

## COMMUNICATION.

FOR THE STAR.

Messrs. Editors.—The old fellow "Ned" seems to have taken much offence that he should not have been suffered to play the part of a political Quack with impunity. He therefore scolds and vaunts, and insists upon his skill in his profession, without deigning to meet the fact which I adduced to shew his views and those of his favorite Candidate. Sober reason would inquire, why "Ned" has taken no notice of the extract I made from Mr. Crawford's report respecting the effect of his system of taxation, in producing an "ample supply" of "domestic manufactures?" The answer is plain. "Ned" commenced with the design of covering Mr. Crawford's principles with the plea of Revenue. Those extracts which presented his Tariff system under the head of mere revenue, he selected, while he avoided the passages which introduce fully into view the principle of encouraging domestic industry. All the writers on that side follow this deceptive mode; or else, by a perverted statement of some particular votes and expressions, attempt to shew that Mr. Crawford is not as great a sinner as General Jackson. "Ned" was very unguarded, while claiming the candor, to make so palpable a perversion as he has done of my sentence. "He thinks it will have a wonderful effect to show that General Jackson thought," &c. "Ned" leaves out the first words, and represents one as saying General Jackson thought," &c. Let any man compare the pieces, and judge of "Ned's" candor. But the unfair and presuming manner in which the Caucus Gentry endeavor to support their Candidate, is apparent from the personalities to which they are descending. Does "Ned" suppose his Virginia cloth is not known to me; or his political standing? I forbear more explicit description. "Ned" may be assured that I am not disposed to introduce him before the public otherwise than as a politician, and I am very sorry, for his sake, that he should have degraded himself by the illiberal and unmerited personal allusions he has made. Whoever he may have alluded to, however, he has missed his man; and his "Tow Cloth" is returned to him to wipe off the dirt he has acquired by his imprudence.

## HOMESPUN.

FOR THE STAR.

Messrs. Editors.—The Editors of the Register have taken up the cudgels against me for daring to expose the circular of Mr. Williams to the ridicule and contempt of an insulted Public. Why the Editors should have singled out this piece for remarks, they must judge; but I will observe, that they have thereby and therein discovered how far they have departed from that fairness and prudence for which the paper was remarkable in former years. With what propriety do the Editors of the Register represent me as reflecting on the practice of writing Circulars by the Representatives in Congress, when I expressly state, that it is a practice "not to be censured?" And what must be their imprudence in lugging in the whole Representation of North Carolina into the range of Mr. Williams's electioneering policy? I think they have betrayed as little prudence as self respect. They have not only descended to an unnecessary "rudeness," but they have misrepresented the occasion of their interference. I am neither un mindful of personal respect, the true statement of a subject, the distinction between one man and another, or even between personal and political character; but, whatever the Editors of the Register might think necessary, if the host which they were presented to excite my alarm, were really (which is not the fact) arrayed against me, they would find me

## NO LICK SPITTLE.

FOR THE STAR.

Messrs. Bell & Lawrence.—Enclosed you have an answer, to the question proposed in the Star of the 18th ult., by J. H. B. of Lawrenceville, Va. which you will please insert, together with the question attached to the answer.

CASWELL FINCH.

From the Star of June 18.

The following question having gone the rounds among the northern papers, and only an approximate answer obtained, I request you will give it a place in the Star, with a hope it may meet the eye of some of our Southern Mathematicians. A. and B. purchase 300 acres of land for \$5000: in the division, A. proposes to give 75 cents per acre more than B. if B. will consent to his part's being taken where he pleases. How much land must each have for his \$300, and what will it cost each per acre?

J. B. B.

Lawrenceville, Va. 5th June, 1834.

A. must have 124 1/3 Acres, which cost 2 dols. 44 cts 3 1/443 m. per acre—\$500.

B. must have 177 1/5 Acres, which cost him 1 dol. 69 cts 1/443 per acre—\$300.

A squared piece of timber, hewed very neat, Contains in the whole 16 Cubic feet; The base at one end is 3-8 the other, The depth of each end I'de have you discover. The length of it too I'de have you to seek, It's five times as long as the big end is deep.

## POLITICAL.

### Report of the Committee of Investigation.

The Select Committee, to whom was referred the Memorial, or Address, of Nott Edwards, having, in obedience to the resolution of the House of Representatives, of the 26th of May, continued to hold its sittings after the adjournment of the House, until the 1st day of June, have agreed on the following

### REPORT:

In recommending in their former Report, a continuance of the existence and powers of the Committee, it will be remembered, that the reason given for that recommendation was, the obvious propriety, before a final close of the investigation, of having the personal presence and examination of the author of the address which had occasioned the appointment of the Committee. Such examination has now been had. Mr. Edwards attended the Committee, in obedience to its summons, on the 7th of June; has been examined as a witness, by its direction, cross-examined by a gentleman attending in behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury; and his testimony, together with that of the other witnesses, is communicated with this Report; as are, also, various documents and papers, which have been referred to, and produced, in the course of the examination.

A paper, in reply to the communication heretofore received by the Committee, from the Secretary, and another, in the nature of an argument on the whole case, have also been presented by Mr. Edwards, and considered by the Committee.

The evidence has run into much detail, and some parts of it, probably, have not a very material application to the main subject of inquiry. It seemed proper however, to the Committee, to allow to those concerned a liberal indulgence in this respect.

After patient attention to all the evidence, and to whatever has been urged, in the way of reasoning on the case, the Committee see no cause to change or modify, in any material respect, the result to which they came on the former investigation, and which they have already submitted to the House. On the contrary, they find, in this further and fuller examination, a corroboration, generally speaking, of the opinions which they have heretofore expressed.

On some parts of the inquiry, indeed, evidence has now been produced to points which were not, individually and particularly, taken into the consideration of the Committee on the former occasion. To these, perhaps, some reference ought now to be made. They may be considered as new articles, or new specifications of charge; and although not very definitely or formally made, yet, as evidence has been taken, intended to support them, they become subjects of consideration.

One of these respects the deposits of public money, made or allowed by the Secretary, in the Banks of this District, at the instance and on the solicitation of the Banks themselves, and as an accommodation to them, at a time of considerable pecuniary pressure, in 1819.

In their former Report, the Committee expressed their opinion in relation to deposits of this nature; and referred to a public communication of the Secretary, in which the facts were avowed, and in which a practice, of a like character, was stated to have been of early existence and long continuance. The Committee did not deem it necessary to call for proof of that which was admitted; and as it was of opinion that the practice itself was irregular and dangerous, it did not think it material to inquire, particularly, whether, in the

only case in which loss was apprehended from this cause, the probability of such loss was either greater or less than the Secretary had supposed. This apprehended loss is in the case of the Franklin Bank of Alexandria. In the letter of the Secretary to the President of the Senate, of the 25th of February, 1823, he says, in regard to this Bank, that a letter of the District Attorney, therewith communicated, showed that there was no danger of loss to the U. S. The evidence now offered and received, tends to show that there is a probability of final loss from this Bank; but in other respects there is no new view of the case presented.

The debt due to the Government from the Bank of Vincennes, has also been brought forward, and made the subject of inquiry and proof. Nothing distinguished this case from those of other Western Banks in which the public money had been deposited, and in regard to which loss had happened, or was expected, had attracted the attention of the Committee, as important to be considered, at the time of their former Report.

The case of this bank had been previously made the subject of a Report to the House by the Secretary, on the 21st of February, 1825, in answer to a resolution passed on the thirty-first of January preceding, in which a statement of the debt, and the means which had been taken and used to secure it, were laid before Congress. The evidence now taken, relates principally, as in the preceding case, to the amount of the loss which may be expected to be incurred.

The only remaining charge which may be regarded as not before examined, is an allegation, or intimation, that, owing to the fault of the Secretary, the pensioners and public creditors of the government in East Tennessee, were, in some instances, paid in bank paper not equivalent to specie.

The circumstances attending this transaction seem to be fully stated in the testimony of Hugh L. White. It does not appear that any knowledge of these payments having been made in depreciated paper was communicated to the Secretary. The measures adopted by him for the reasonable provision of a proper fund at the place of disbursement, were, as far as the Committee can judge, suitable and judicious. He had a right to expect the payments to be made in specie, or its equivalent; or, at least, to be informed if any thing should happen to prevent such payment. No information was given to him of any disappointment of his expectation in this respect; by those whose duty it was to pay; and no complaint appears to have been preferred by those whose right it was to receive.

In regard to the contested letter of Benjamin Stephenson, of the 12th of October, 1819, the Committee see no cause to change the opinion which was entertained, and which they intended to express in their former report—that, although the letter was written, as stated by Mr. Edwards in his testimony, there was no evidence that Mr. Stephenson communicated or transmitted it to the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Committee do not deem it necessary to extend their Report, by protracted observations on the various parts of the evidence, as the whole is submitted to the House. They content themselves with saying, that, in their opinion, nothing has been proved to impeach the integrity of the Secretary, or to bring into doubt the general correctness and ability of his administration of the public finances. To this point, as the main object of inquiry, the chief attention of the Committee has been directed; and they have come to the result, which has now been stated, with the unanimous concurrence of the members present. Other points there are, of less importance, but which may, nevertheless, be supposed not to have escaped consideration by the Committee. These, however, under all the circumstances, they have thought it proper to leave, without observation, in the light in which they are placed by the evidence.

From the Columbia (S. C.) Telescope.  
To the good people of South Carolina.

No. 1.

Judge Smith, who has so freely remarked on others, cannot complain that he, in turn, should become the subject of remark. I do not intend to comment on the manner of making his debut before the good people of South Carolina, however extraordinary it was in many of its circumstances; for we find him first relating his grievances in the columns of a distant paper, the National Intelligencer, under an allegation insinuating to the State, that he could not obtain a hearing, even in vindication of himself through any one of our numerous newspapers. Under this insinuation, and as has since been proved, unfounded allegation, he obtained admittance into the columns of the paper to which I have referred, where he freely arraigns the state before the tribunal of the public opinion, of the nation, for having dared, in the exercise of his constitutional right, to refuse to re-elect him to the Senate of the United States.

Placing a high estimate on his own qualifications, he attributes his defeat, not to the superior qualifications of his highly gifted competitor, nor to the fact that he had joined a faction, which had risen against the administration of our venerable and virtuous chief magistrate, but to the contrivance & management of his enemies. Having conjured up in his imagination a plot against his re-election, he, in that style of decorum, so peculiar to himself, denounces all of the supposed participants, abettors, and accessories. In this career of denunciation, the columns of the Intelligencer were closed against him. He entered it on the condition of acting on the defensive, but impatient of so passive a character, he speedily became the assailant, and thus violating the condition of admittance, the editors were forced to turn him out. When personal attack is the object, our censor is not however easily checked. Expelled from the Intelligencer he next appears in the Telescope, where he commences his attacks against Mr. Calhoun, charging him with the double sin of being ambitious, and mysterious in his political course on the tariff.

It is not my intention to defend Mr. Calhoun against these charges. If it were, the feebleness of the proof by which they are attempted to be sustained, would afford an easy victory; but there is little virtue in a character acquired as Mr. Calhoun's has been by a life of labor, candor and patriotism, if it cannot sustain him against the mere suspicions and surmises of a vindictive political enemy! The Mr. Calhoun has no need of defence against groundless charges, yet "the good people of South Carolina" have a just right to know what is the object of the judge in making them at this time. As resentful as he is for supposed wrongs, he is not simply indulging his spleen against Mr. Calhoun and a majority of our delegation in congress. Nor is his motive, the anticipated pleasure of humbling those whom he fancies to be his enemies, vindictive as he is. To understand the real motives, we must remember that the judge is a partisan enlisted under the banners of "King Caucus," and a true and loyal subject he is. He is devoted to the election of the caucus candidate, and it is his belief that he cannot succeed in this state, but by the prostration of Mr. Calhoun, and with him his friends; and the great instrument by which this is to be effected, is by a dextrous use of the tariff, for which purpose he has dragged it into his third number. The most careless reader of that number must see that its immediate object is to fix the odium which is attached to the tariff in this state on Mr. Calhoun; but it is not quite so easily perceived, that there is an object beyond, which is to turn this very odium to the account of Mr. Crawford. This idol of the caucus party is not, as is known to the judge, the object of the political veneration of "the good people of South Carolina," and hence, for the present, till the public mind is prepared, he who is to be benefited is carefully kept out of view. In due time, however, it is intended to come out openly and proclaim him as the only statesman friendly to the interest of this, and the other southern states; unless, indeed, the abhorrence in which himself and his politics are held, should continue to be such as to blast even the hope of success. He will be held up as the real anti-tariff candidate, but in such a manner as to injure him as little as possible with the manufacturing interests beyond the Potomac. Now if the judge and his associates in this state were really the enemies of the tariff, and in consequence opposed to Mr. Calhoun, because they sincerely conceived him to be its friend, and supported openly, Mr. Crawford, because they believed him to be its opponent, the course would at least be candid, and in that view, commendable. Such, however, is not the fact; and although I do not accuse him of being the friend of the tariff, I do accuse him of being much more opposed to Mr. Calhoun, and in favor of Mr. Crawford than opposed to the tariff, and of using it merely as a political instrument, to depress the former, and to elevate the latter of those two gentlemen.

I proceed to make good this charge against the judge, which deeply implicates his character as an honest politician, and which I would not venture to make without the most settled conviction of its truth, arising out of the strongest proofs. I shall prove it by shewing that he has dealt most unfairly and unjustly between Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Crawford, as well by what he has said against the latter. I shall shew that what he has said against Mr. Calhoun is erroneous, and that what he has supposed as to Mr. Crawford is most important to be known to the "good people of South Carolina," whose vote he is endeavoring, through the use of the Tariff, secretly to secure for him. If I succeed in both these points, then I may assert with confidence, that the object of our ex-senator is men not measures, and instead of regarding him as an honest and zealous opponent of a measure, which he considers as opposed to the interests of the state, he can be regarded in no other light than as an artful partisan cunningly using the Tariff for sinister purposes. Sincerity is the distinguishing trait of the Carolina character, and it will not tolerate a covered and artful attempt to prostrate a favorite son, in order to elevate one who has no claim on the state or nation.

Reserving for the present, the examination of the unfounded accusations against Mr. Calhoun, I will proceed at once to do what the judge has omitted to do; I mean to exhibit to the "good people of South Carolina," the course of Mr. Crawford, in relation to the Tariff, and to prove that it is of the most mischievous character, and so far as the passage of the tariff bill, in its modified shape, shall prove injurious, he will be more to blame than any other individual, not even excepting Mr. Clay. His official situation in the Treasury has given him the means of the most decided control in relation to it. Divided as congress has been on it, Mr. Crawford has at all times had it in his power to defeat the passage of this bill, if he were really opposed to it, or rather if he really preferred the interest of the country to his own advancement. What has been the fact? We find him, session after session, recommending a revision of the tariff, and increase of duties, on those very articles which he knew would be acceptable to the manufacturers! I know that for the most part, he has professed in his recommendations,

to have in view, only an increase of the revenue; but let it be remembered, that in his various annual reports, when the treasury was full, he was ever saying, he has continued the same recommendations! These recommendations, as is well known, especially to the intelligent at the capital, have been constant protests for reporting a tariff bill from year to year, and in the discussion of the subject, we invariably find the authority of the secretary, (a southern man,) quoted in its favor by the advocates of the measure. Mr. Crawford, however, never makes a move, without securing the means of retreat. It is essentially a part of his tactics. While he has been engaged in thus attempting to secure the manufacturing interests, he and his friends, have been equally busy in soothing the agriculturists of the south, who were to be reconciled by the plea of revenue, even though the treasury were full. Now the name of common sense, what difference can it make to our farmers whether an increased duty is to be laid on cotton bagging, or any other article of southern consumption to encourage the fabrication of home, or to augment the revenue, when not required? Do they not bear the same burden, whatever the motive, or rather the pretext, may be?

If Mr. Clay and Mr. Crawford agree in advocating the same rates of duty, it matters not as to their objects, whether they are the same or not. Our burden will be precisely the same, the effect on the revenue the same, and the encouragement of domestic manufactures the same. The only difference is in the characters of the two men. The one does an injury, openly and boldly, the other while inflicting the same injury, endeavors to persuade us he is our best friend.

To this general inference, founded on Mr. Crawford's treasury reports, I might add the suspicious silence in the late discussion of the tariff, in the house of representatives, of this Georgia delegate, and of the friends of Mr. Crawford generally. They voted on our side, it is true, but really left the battle to our delegation, which has, with such distinguished zeal and ability maintained the southern interests. I have said they voted with us. It requires, however, one most important exception or qualification, to make the assertion true. A motion was made by Mr. Owen, of Alabama, to take the opinion of the secretary of the treasury, on the effect of the proposed duties on the revenue—A most important point, and calculated, above all others, to defeat the bill. The tariff-men accordingly warmly resisted the motion, seeing that if successful, it must be fatal, and the friends of Mr. Crawford, led by Mr. Forsyth, joined them in the opposition, lest Mr. Crawford should be compelled to come out!

By this union, the motion was lost, and the passage of the bill secured in the house! I am not yet done with Mr. Crawford on the tariff. If, as I have shown, his general course in relation to this important subject, has been mischievous, particular acts of his have been no less injurious to the South.

The most odious items in the whole bill, is the duty on cotton bagging. It is an article of the coarsest fabric, requiring, in its manufacture, neither skill nor capital, and is not connected with the independence or defense of the country, to which may be added the fact, that the domestic bagging is of inferior quality, and must, from the mode of preparing the material of which it is made, remain so; for it is manufactured of dew rotted hemp, which stains the cotton and affects its sale. Against this odious item, our representation made the most vigorous efforts, notwithstanding which, it passed the house, and that on the authority of Mr. Crawford, whom Judge Smith and his associates will hold up as the anti-tariff candidate! To leave the judge without excuse, Mr. Crawford lent his authority to this objectionable item, so far back as January, 1818, whilst our ex-senator was in congress, about the time he was forming his political connection with the Caucus Chief. On the 28th of Feb. 1817, Mr. Crawford was called on by the house of representatives, to report what measures were necessary to this more effectual collection of the revenue, and on the 19th of January 1818, after the lapse of about one year, which certainly afforded him ample time for reflection, he made his report. The revenue was at the time abundant, so much so, that the internal taxes were repealed at the beginning of the same session, on the estimate of the secretary, that the income from the customs, under existing duties, were ample to meet the public expenditure. Notwithstanding this, he seizes on the occasion, slight as it is, to recommend an increase duty on many of the most important objects of consumption at the south, and among others, cotton bagging, from what motives I leave his friends to explain. This article then paid an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent, which is about equal to 2 1/4 cents per yard. Mr. Crawford recommended, in the report to which I have referred, that it should be changed into a specific duty of six cents a yard, equal to about 43 per cent ad valorem, which has not been accepted by congress; a duty of 3 and 3/4 cents per yard being adopted. The recommendation by Mr. Crawford of 6 cents, however, was the basis on which the committee rest the report as to this item in the present tariff bill.

Let us for a moment trace the effects of this item on the cotton states. We use about three million five hundred thousand yards annually, which at 3 3/4 cents per yard (the difference between the then existing duty and that recommended by Mr. Crawford,) would make an annual tax on those states of \$121,250. To this we may add the loss from the had quality of the domestic bagging, and its injurious effects on the cotton by staining, of 25 cents per bag, which I deem moderate, and which would make on our annual product of 600,000 bags—\$150,000. The two items would make an annual charge, or tax of \$271,250 on the cotton states; of which sum we may safely put down one third, or \$90,416 as the share of the burthen of this odious tax, that would actually fall on us; and had it been adopted when recommended by Mr. Crawford, seven years ago, it would have taken from the pockets of "the good people of S. Carolina," upwards of \$500,000, and put that amount in the pockets of the Kentucky manufacturers. Mr. Clay, by his casting vote in the house of representatives, carried the item at 3 3/4 cents per yard; but Mr. Crawford, by his

[See 4th Page.]