

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 in paid advance...

FOR THE STAR.

"One prospect lost, another still we gain; And not one vanity is given in vain."

It will be recollected with what confidence the radical prints prognosticated the success of Mr. Crawford in the Electoral colleges; and that North-Carolina was pledged, as far as the Register could pledge her, to assist, with her 15 votes, in placing him in the Presidential chair...

Pending the election before the people (though it was generally understood that Mr. Crawford could be but the third man on the list) it was gravely insisted on by the modest caucusites, that the election ought not to be carried into the House, but that the caucus dictation should be obeyed by the people in the election of the man thus proposed...

The Editors of the National Intelligencer allege that Mr. C. has been gambled out of 25 votes in New York, &c. As to their abusive epithets on the Legislature of that state I have nothing to object, except that it comes with an

ill grace from them. That body deserves to be scourged for not obeying the voice of the people from whom Mr. Crawford could not have obtained a vote. But the ground of complaint relative to the blank votes certainly fails them; that question was solemnly decided by the House of Representatives of the U. States, in the contest between Jefferson and Burr, and has recently been published; and that decision seems to me to be founded in reason. In all balloting by legislative bodies, it is sufficient if there be a constitutional quorum present; the number of members beyond this is known only by the number of ballots—their names are not enrolled on such occasions. To ballot is to choose by ballot, but where no name is put in there is no object of choice. A ballot is a ticket designating the object of choice; but how can a member be said to exercise the right of voting when he makes no choice? A member may and often does omit to put in a ballot or even a blank slip of paper; when this is the case his name is never counted in ascertaining the majority, nor indeed can it be known whether all have voted or not, unless they be personally counted and the number compared with the votes, which I believe is never done. The majority is always ascertained by the votes given in; and how can a blank piece of paper, any more than a leaf or any other substance, represent a member? A voter may put in a slip of blank paper with his ballot, without violating any rule of order or decorum.

But it is said by these caucus Editors, that "Mr. Crawford has been manoeuvred out of 15 votes in North Carolina"—that "some 5000 of these votes (Jackson's) were given by the friends of Mr. Adams, under the idea that a proportion of the votes of the electors chosen would be given for him"—that "a plurality of the people voted for Mr. C. although Gen. J. for whom a plurality did not vote, will receive the vote of the state"—that each voter has been induced "to believe he was voting for his own ticket, when in fact he was assisting a candidate to whom, in all probability, he might have preferred Mr. C., against whom he in fact voted"—that "out of the whole 50,000 votes, the two tickets combined against Mr. C. have not obtained a majority of more than one twentieth of the whole number of votes given in—that Mr. C. is placed before the House of Representatives on ground as strong, in the eye of reason, as if he had received an equal number of votes with either of the other candidates." And, to swell the popularity of Mr. C. they bring into account the votes of minorities in states where he failed entirely, and in some instances where no vote was intended for him; but they have carefully omitted the large number of votes given to the other candidates in Virginia, Georgia, &c. These quotations may serve as a specimen of the licentiousness or liberty (if you please) of the press: now let facts answer them. It is well known that in this State a ticket was formed, called the People's Ticket, for such anti-caucus candidate as should appear to be the most prominent about the time of the election. Mr. Calhoun, while his name was up, was looked to as the most popular candidate; afterwards Gen. Jackson appeared to stand foremost; but as Mr. Adams had many friends in the state; it was proposed that the voters should designate their choice of these two, by writing the name of Jackson or Adams on the tickets, and that he who should obtain the greatest number of such votes, should be supported by the Electors. This mode however was soon objected to; the people required a single object for their choice; and Mr. Adams's name was dropped and Gen. J. alone was held up as the peoples' candidate. This event was a desideratum with the enemies of the administration; they had laboured unceasingly and used all the stratagem their inventive imaginations could devise to bring it about; and as soon as it was publicly declared, (which was a few weeks previous to the election) they vaunted over what they considered a disunion of the administration party, and invited the friends of Mr. A. to come over to them; and then it was when they commenced the publication of the infamous calumnies of Jesse Benton, which, though basely false, produced a considerable change in the public mind, unfavorable to Gen. Jackson's election; they had the effect of driving many of the friends of Mr. A. over to the caucus side, and of keeping many more from the polls. The people's ticket was printed and distributed throughout the State as a Jackson ticket, and was so voted by every man who put it in the box; the friends of Mr. C. as well as the friends of Gen. J. were careful to make that fact known—the people understood it perfectly; it was published in the newspapers, and declared by the candidates on the ticket.

These are facts which will hardly be denied; then let the reader compare them with the columns of the National Intelligencer and draw his own inference. It is true that some of the voters, to show their preference for Mr. A. did write his name on their tickets, knowing at the same time that the candidates on the ticket would vote for Gen. J.; the number of such however was not "some 5000," but, from the best information I have been able to obtain was about five or six hundred—certainly less than a thousand; and some who voted for Mr. Crawford also endorsed the name of Adams on their tickets.

It is surely preposterous to contend that because Gen. J. was not, by some of his voters, preferred to all other men, that he should sink below the very man these voters certainly intended to vote against. Some of Mr. Crawford's voters would have preferred other men; but as no man who suited them better was run for the appointment, they gave their suffrages to him; just so did those whose first choice was Adams and second choice Jackson. There were but two candidates held up at the polls for the choice of the people, and they were held up openly and fairly, and the people voted with a full knowledge of what they were doing.

The number of votes taken in this State was 36,036; Gen. Jackson's majority was 4,794—considerably more than one eighth of the whole number. These are facts well known. How then, let me ask, has Mr. Crawford a plurality of the votes of this State? Or how has he been cheated or manoeuvred out of them?

Where now is the "moral influence" on our Representatives, favourable to Mr. Crawford? Are they not morally bound by the will of the people to vote against him?

Already have several of the Representatives of our State declared that they will give up their individual preference and vote according to the wishes of the majority of the people; and I do hope and trust there is intelligence and integrity enough in our representation to rule them to a proper discharge of their duty. That duty is too clearly delineated by the sovereign will of the people not to be understood and felt. To say nothing of the effect which a resistance to that will would produce at the next election, it is hoped that our Representatives will feel themselves conscientiously bound faithfully to represent the wishes of the people, so clearly and so powerfully expressed. There is a moral fitness in the thing; and a departure from it would seem to argue a dereliction of principle and of duty. It is no argument to say that because three candidates are constitutionally before the House, the third on the list has an equal claim to their vote, unless he should stand as the first in the state they represent. A case indeed might occur where a candidate should obtain the electoral votes of a majority of the states, and yet stand as the third man in point of numbers.—In such a case, pursuing the principle I contend for, the Representatives from those states ought to vote for him; and the large states could have no cause of complaint; for such is the result of that compromise of conflicting interests which we all acknowledge and admire in our Federal Constitution, to the supremacy of which we must all bow. In the present instance, no one of the candidates has a majority of the states by the electoral votes. What is to be done in such a case? The friends of one of the candidates must yield, and who shall it be? Surely the two foremost will not be laid aside to accommodate the third man on the list; but the states which have supported him, it would seem, ought to throw their weight into the scale of one of the others.

These are the crude suggestions of the moment and are intended merely to bring the subject before the public.

But before I conclude I wish to correct another error which the Editors of the National Intelligencer have fallen into. They claim for Mr. C. a vote in Maine, because the Elector who obtained the majority and who would have voted for Mr. Adams, was a post master and therefore not eligible. "In the eye of reason" these suffrages should have the same "moral influence" on the minds of the Representatives as though the Elector had voted; but upon no principle can the vote be counted for Mr. C. It is lost to Mr. A. and to every body else. In ordinary cases there would be another election; but in the case before us there is no remedy. It would be a monstrous anomaly in elective representation to send a man who should obtain a few votes, against the will of a large majority who happened to fix on a man constitutionally disqualified.

CATO.

CONGRESS.

SENATE.

Monday, Dec. 20.

Mr. Hayne, from the committee to whom was referred the subject of making provision for Gen. Lafayette, reported the following bill:

A bill making provision for General Lafayette. Be it enacted, &c. That the sum of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars be and the same is hereby granted to Major General Lafayette, in compensation for his important services and expenditures during the American Revolution, and that for this purpose, a stock to that amount be issued in his favor, dated the 4th July, 1824 bearing an annual interest of six per cent, payable quarterly, and redeemable on the 31st December, 1834.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That one complete and entire Township of Land be, and the same is hereby granted to the said Major General Lafayette, and that the President of the United States be authorized to cause the said Township to be located on any of the Public Lands which remain unsold, and that Patents be issued to General Lafayette for the same.

The bill was twice read, by general consent, and Mr. Hayne gave notice that he should move its third reading to-morrow.

Mr. Macon presented the following resolution for consideration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to inquire into the expediency of limiting the number of cadets at the Military Academy at West Point, to the number of Members in the House of Representatives, and that the number to be admitted from each State and Territory, respectively, shall be the same as that of the Representatives, to which such State or Territory shall be entitled, and that the brother of no person educated at the Academy shall be admitted, so long as there be other applicants, and that provision be made for admitting from the District of Columbia.

Tuesday, Dec. 21.

The resolution offered yesterday by Mr. Macon, proposing an inquiry on the subject of limiting the number of cadets to be admitted at the Military Academy, was taken up and adopted.

The Senate according to the order of the day, took up the bill making provision for Gen. Lafayette; and after considerable debate, it was read the third time and passed—yeas 39, nays 7—and sent to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

Mr. Barbour submitted the following, which was taken up and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to cause to be communicated to the Senate, such information as he may possess (and which may be safely communicated) relative to the piracies referred to in his message, and the means heretofore adopted by the Executive for their suppression; and that the President be also requested to state the additional means necessary and expedient to be entrusted to the Executive for the suppression of the same.

Thursday, Dec. 23.

The resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. Ruggles, requesting of the President of the United States information respecting the extent of piratical depredations on our commerce, &c. was taken up, and agreed to.

The bill passed by the House of Representatives, "concerning Gen. Lafayette," was brought to the Senate for concurrence.

The bill was read the first time, and ordered to be read a second time; it was then, on motion of Mr. Barbour, read a second time, without objection, and taken up in committee of the whole. No amendment or objection being made to the bill in committee of the whole, it was reported to the Senate, and on the question of ordering the bill to a third reading, it was carried with but one audible dissenting voice. The bill was then, and by unanimous consent, read the third time, passed, and returned to the other House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, Dec. 20.

On motion of Mr. Stevenson, Resolved, That the Committee of Claims be instructed to inquire into the propriety of providing by law for the reimbursement of the amount of interest, paid by the state of Virginia upon loans of money negotiated by her for the use of the General Government, during the late war between Great Britain and the United States.

On motion of Mr. Mallory, of Vermont, Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be instructed to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation for collecting materials, and preparing for the building of a steam vessel of war for the defence of Lake Champlain.

On motion of Mr. Mangum, it was Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be instructed to inquire into the expediency of establishing a post route from Raleigh, N. C. by Little Nat. Jones's to Haywood, in Chatham county.

Mr. Whipple, of N. H. laid on the table the following: Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate to this House any information which he may possess and which in his opinion it may not be improper to make public, relative to the intentions of the allied powers of Europe to aid Spain in the subjugation and recovery of her former Colonies in America.

On motion of Mr. Duffie, it was Resolved, That a select committee be appointed with instructions to inquire into the expediency and practicability of limiting and regulating the sales of the public lands in such manner that the quantity brought into market may not exceed the effective demand at a fair and natural price; and with further instructions to inquire into any abuses which may exist from the combination of capitalists for the purpose of defrauding the government, or from the defective organization of the land office system; and, if any such abuses are found to exist, to devise and report some plan by which they may be corrected.

On motion of Mr. Gatlin, of N. C. it was Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to inquire into the expediency of erecting a lighthouse on the South end of Roanoke Island, in the State of North Carolina.

SETTLEMENT OF THE OREGON. Mr. Floyd, of Virginia, moved that the House go into committee of the whole on the state of the Union, with a view to take up the bill "for the occupation of the mouth of the Columbia or Oregon river;" which was agreed to, and the House went into committee accordingly.

The bill was read by sections, and the several blanks were filled. The committee then rose and the House adjourned.

Tuesday, Dec. 21.

Mr. Randolph, from the Committee on the services and sacrifices of Gen. Lafayette, reported a bill "concerning General Lafayette;" which was twice read and made the order of the day for to-day. [It is a transcript of the bill yesterday reported in the Senate, proposing to grant \$200,000 in stock, and one entire township of land.]

The resolution yesterday offered by Mr. Whipple, calling for information as to the intention of the allied powers to aid Spain in recovering her former dominions in South America was taken up and agreed to.

Mr. Randolph moved that the orders of the day be dispensed with, in order to take up the bill concerning Gen. Lafayette. The question was put and carried by a large majority.

The House accordingly went into committee of the whole on that bill and, after some discussion, it was laid on the table, for the purpose of allowing the members time to consider its merits.

Wednesday, Dec. 22.

The House then resumed the consideration of the bill providing for the occupation of the Columbia or Oregon River, which after undergoing several amendments, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading to-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Little, of Maryland, the House resumed the consideration of the bill yesterday reported by a committee of the House "concerning Gen. Lafayette." Considerable debate ensued, when the question was taken on ordering the bill to be engrossed, and decided in the affirmative by a large majority.

It was then ordered that the bill should be read a third time to-day.

The bill was then read a third time, accordingly, and the question thereupon decided: yeas 166, Nays 26.

Thursday, Dec. 23.

The Speaker laid before the house a letter from Mons. A. Sheffer, of Paris, presenting to the acceptance of Congress a full length portrait of General Lafayette, which was laid on the table. The letters in the following terms:

"Sir: I send by the ship 'Cadmus' Captain Francis Allyn, (who has kindly promised to take it on to Washington,) a full length portrait of Gen. Lafayette, painted by me, which I pray you to do me the honor to accept, for the Hall of the House of Representatives, over which you preside.

"As the friend and admirer of General Lafayette, and of American Liberty, I feel happy to have it in my power to express, in this way, my grateful feelings for the national honor which the free people of the U. States are at this moment bestowing on the friend and companion in arms of your illustrious Washington, on the man who has been so gloriously received by you as the 'Nation's Guest.'

"Accept, sir, with the above testimony of my sentiments, for your country and for my venerable friend, the sincere assurance of my profound respect

"A. SCHEFFER."

To the Hon. the Speaker, of the H. of R. of the U. S.

On motion of Mr. Lathrop of Mass. it was Resolved, That the committee on the Judiciary be directed to consider the expediency of increasing the fees of Jurors who may be summoned to attend the Circuit and District Courts.

On motion of Mr. Archer of Va.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate to the House any information in his possession, not improper to be communicated, explaining the character and objects of the visit of the naval officer of the United States, commanding in the West Indies, to the town of Pinaro, in the Island of Porto Rico, on the 25th day of November last.

The engrossed bill "To provide for occupying the Columbia or Oregon River;" was read a third time and passed—yeas 113, nays 57.