

Western Carolinian.

SALISBURY, N. C. TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1827.

[VOL. VIII.....NO. 378.]

The terms of the Western Carolinian are, \$3 per annum—or \$2 50, if paid in advance. But payment in advance will be required from all subscribers at a distance, who are unknown to the Editor, unless some responsible person of his acquaintance guarantees the payment. The paper discontinued, (except at the option of the Editor) until all arrearages are paid. Advertisements will be inserted at fifty cents per square for the first insertion, and twenty cents for each subsequent one. All letters addressed to the Editor, must be post-paid, or they may not be attended to.

New Establishment.
BENNET H. STAMMIRE,
HAS commenced the **TAILORING BUSINESS** in the room formerly occupied by Thomas Dickson, attached to Thos. L. Comen's Store, opposite to Kyle and Meenan's Store, and very convenient to all the other Stores in town; where he is prepared to execute, in a style of workmanship not inferior to any in the United States, all descriptions of work in his line of business, both for Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Stam mire and myself having made arrangements to carry on the business in connexion, we will thereby be enabled to accommodate all who may feel disposed to patronize us, on as short notice as can be wished for, and on terms as reasonable as any Tailor in the State, who will execute his work in a style equal to ours.
MILAS TEMPLETON will continue his shop at the old stand, formerly occupied by Bevell and Temmison, between Edward and Cross's Store and James B. Hampton's Watch-Maker's Shop. As both Shops the best of workmen will be employed, and the latest fashions regularly received from Philadelphia and New-York; which, with the advantage of having two shops, will afford greater facilities for executing work than any establishment which has heretofore existed in this part of the country.
Milas Templeton is grateful for the patronage he has hitherto received; and hopes that his and Mr. Stam mire's faithful attention to business, will not only insure them a continuance of that liberal patronage, but an additional business, which their present situation will enable them to attend to, and which will secure all those who favor them with work, against any disappointment in its prompt execution.
Salisbury, August 16, 1827. 76

TAILORING BUSINESS.
THE subscribers having entered into copartnership, for the purpose of carrying on the Tailoring Business, under the firm of **HAGUE & HAMPTON**, take this method of respectfully informing the citizens of Cabarrus county, and the adjacent country, that they have commenced business in the shop heretofore occupied by Mr. Hague, opposite Mr. Alexander's House of Entertainment, in the town of Concord, where they are prepared to execute all descriptions of work in their line of business, in the most substantial manner, and after the most fashionable styles of workmanship. Having made arrangements for receiving quarterly, from Philadelphia, the latest fashions in vogue there, they will be enabled to suit any gentleman with the newest fashioned dress garments, made up after the Patent Protractor system of tailoring. Their prices for work, will be as follows:
Fine Cloth Coats, . . . \$5 to 6
Homespun cloth Coats, . . . 3
Pantaloon, . . . 1 25
Waistcoats, . . . 1 25 to 1 50
The public are invited to try our shop; we only ask a fair trial; if we then fail of satisfying, we are content not to be patronized.
THOMAS A. HAGUE,
WADE W. HAMPTON.
Concord, July 10, 1827. 878

Look at This!
THE subscribers, (Thos. V. Canon and Benjamin Fraley) having this day entered into copartnership in the
Tailoring Business,
to be carried on in the Shop formerly occupied by Thomas V. Canon, in the town of Concord; this is to inform the citizens of Concord and the adjacent country, that the subscribers have just received the latest fashions, and will continue to receive them as often as there is any change from the cities of Philadelphia and New-York; and are determined to have their work done in a style superior to any in the United States, and on the lowest terms, according to workmanship. Any person wishing work done in their line will please give their shop a trial; and if they fall getting their garments made as prescribed, or fail getting fitted, in the neatest style, they will be paid for their cloth.
All kinds of Cutting will be done at the subscribers' shop; and no pains spared in showing the Ladies how to put their dresses together, after they are cut out. One of the subscribers has gone on North, for the purpose of forwarding the neatest and most approved fashions of the day. The grave can be accommodated at this shop, as well as the gay. All orders from a distance, will be promptly attended to.
THOMAS V. CANON,
BENJAMIN FRALEY.
Concord, July 25th, 1827. 578

BOOK BINDING.
THE subscriber respectfully informs the citizens of Salisbury, and the surrounding country, that he has established a **Book Bindery** in said town, on Main Street, a few doors south of the Court-House; where he will be thankful to receive any kind of work in his line of business. From a number of years experience, in Europe and America, he feels confident of being able to give entire satisfaction to all who may patronize him with any description of Binding.
Blank Books made to order, after any pattern furnished, on short notice, and at prices which no one can complain of.
Old Books Rebound, either plain or ornamental, on the most moderate terms. All orders from a distance, faithfully attended to. The patronage of the public is respectfully solicited, by their obedient servant,
JOHN H. DE CARTERET.
Salisbury, April 26th, 1827. 69

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH.....Continued.
The General states, that the unknown envoy used the terms "Clay's friends," to the exclusion, therefore, of myself, but he nevertheless inferred that he had come from me. Now, why did he draw this inference contrary to the import of the statement which he received? Does not this disposition to deduce conclusions unfavourable to me, manifest the spirit which actuates him? And does not General Jackson exhibit throughout his letter a desire to give a colouring to the statement of his friend, the distinguished member of Congress, higher than it would justify? No one should ever resort to implication but from necessity. Why did he not ascertain from the envoy if he had come from me? Was anything more natural than that General Jackson should ascertain the persons who had deputed the envoy? If his shocked sensibility and indignant virtue and patriotism would not allow him to inquire into particulars, ought he to have hazarded the assertion, that I was privy to the proposal, without assuring himself of the fact? Could he not, after rejecting the proposal, continuing as he did, on friendly terms with the organ of it, have satisfied himself if I were consent of it? If he had not time, then, might he not have ascertained the fact from his friend or from me, during the intervening two and a half years? The compunctions of his own conscience, for a moment, appear to have visited him towards the conclusion of his letter; for he there does say, "that in the supposition stated, I may have done injustice to Mr. Clay; if so, the gentleman informing me can explain." No good or honourable man will do an other voluntarily any injustice. It was not necessary that General Jackson should have done me any. And he cannot acquit himself of the rashness and inquiry of his conduct towards me by referring, at this late day, to a person, whose name is withheld from the public. This commendous mode of administering justice, by first hanging and then trying a man, however justifiable it may be, according to the precepts of the Jackson code, is sanctioned by no respectable system of jurisprudence.

It is stated in the letter of the 6th of June, that the overture was made early in January; and that the second day after the communication, it was announced in the newspapers, that Mr. Clay had come out openly and avowedly in favour of Mr. Adams. The object of this statement is obvious. It is to insinuate that the proposal which was rejected with disdain by General Jackson, was accepted with promptitude by Mr. Adams. This renders the fact as to the time of the alleged announcement very important. It is to be regretted that General Jackson had not been a little more precise. It was early in January that the overture was made, and the second day after, the announcement of my intention took place. Now, I will not assert that there may not have been some speculations in the newspapers about that time, (although I do not believe that there were even any speculations so early,) as to the probable vote which I should give; but I should be glad to see any newspaper which the second day after early in January, asserted in its columns, that I had come out "openly and avowedly in favour of Mr. Adams." I challenge the production of such a paper. I do not believe that my intention so to vote for Mr. Adams was announced in the newspapers openly and avowedly during the whole month of January, or at any rate until late in the month. The only avowal of my intention to vote for him, which was publicly made in the newspapers prior to the election, is contained in my letter to Judge Brooke, which is dated the 28th January. It was first published in the Enquirer at Richmond, some time in the ensuing month. I go further; I do not believe that any newspaper at Washington can be produced, announcing, before the latter part of January, the fact, whether upon my avowal or not, of my intention to vote for Mr. Adams. General Jackson's memory must deceive him. He must have confounded events and circumstances. His friend, Mr. George Kremer, in his letter to the Columbian Observer, bearing date the 25th January, has, according to my recollection of the public prints, a claim to the merit of being the first, or among the first, to announce to the public my intended vote. That letter was first published at Philadelphia, and returned in the Columbian Observer to Washington City on the 31st January. How long before its date that letter was written for Mr. Kremer, does not appear. Whether there be any connexion between the communication made by the distinguished member of Congress, and that letter, perhaps General Jackson can explain.

At the end of more than two years after a corrupt overture is made to Gen-

Jackson, he now, for the first time, openly proclaims it. It is true, as I have ascertained since the publication of Mr. Beverley's Fayetteville letter, the General has been for a long time secretly circulating the charge. Immediately on the appearance at Washington of that letter in the public prints, the Editor of the Telegraph asserted, in his paper, that General Jackson had communicated the overture to him about the period of the election; nor is he now states, but according to Mr. Beverley's version of the tale. Since I left Washington on the 10th of last month, I have understood that General Jackson has made a similar communication to several other persons, at different and distant points. Who has the overture been thus clandestinely circulated? Was it that through the medium of the Telegraph, the leading paper supporting the interest of General Jackson, and through his other depositories, the belief of the charge should be daily and gradually infused into the public mind, and thus contribute to the support of his cause? The zeal and industry with which it has been propagated, the daily columns of certain newspapers can testify. Finding the public still unconvinced, has the General found it to be necessary to come out in proper person through the thin veil of Mr. Carter Beverley's agency.

When the alleged overture was made, the election remained undecided. Why did not General Jackson then hold up to universal scorn and indignation the infamous bearer of the proposal, and those who dared to insult his honour, and tamper with his integrity? If he had at that time denounced all the infamous parties concerned, demanded an inquiry in the House of Representatives, and established by satisfactory proof, the truth of his accusation, there might, and probably would have been, a different result to the election. Why, when at my instance, a committee was on the 5th day of February, 1825, (only four days before the election) appointed to investigate the charges of Mr. Kremer, did not General Jackson present himself and establish their truth? Why, on the 7th of that month, two days before the election, when the committee reported that Mr. Kremer declined to come forward, and that if they knew of any reason for such investigation, they would have asked to be clothed with the proper power, but not having themselves any such knowledge, they have felt it to be their duty only to lay before the House the communication which they have received;—why did not General Jackson authorize a motion to recommend the report, and manfully come forward with all his information? The Congress of the Nation is in session. An important election has devolved on it. All eyes are turned towards Washington. The result is awaited with intense anxiety and breathless expectation. A corrupt proposition, affecting the election, is made to one of the candidates. He receives it, is advised to accept it, deliberates, decides upon it. A committee is in session to investigate the very charge. The candidate, notwithstanding, remains profoundly silent, and after the lapse of more than two years, when the period of an election is rapidly approaching, in which he is the only competitor for the office, for the first time, announces it to the American public! They must have more than an ordinary share of credulity, who do not believe that General Jackson labours under some extraordinary delusion.

It is possible that he may urge, by way of excuse for what must be deemed his culpable concealment of mediated corruption, that he did not like to volunteer as a witness before the committee, or to transmit to it the name of his friend, the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, although it is not very easy to discern any just reason for this volunteering now, which would not have applied with more force at that time. But what apology can be made for his failure to discharge his sacred duty as an American Senator? More than two months after the alleged overture, a nomination to the office which I now hold, was made to the Senate of the United States, of which General Jackson was then a sworn member. On that nomination, he had to deliberate and act in the most solemn manner. If I were privy to a corrupt proposal to General Jackson, touching the recent election; if I had entered into a corrupt bargain with Mr. Adams to secure his elevation, I was unworthy the office to which I was nominated, and it was the duty of General Jackson, if he really possessed the information which he now puts forward, to have moved the Senate to appoint a committee of enquiry, and by establishing my guilt to have preserved the National Councils from an abominable contamination. As the conspiracy of George Kremer & Co. had a short time before, meanly shrunk

from appearing before the committee of the House of Representatives, to make good their charges, I requested a Senator of the United States, when my nomination should be taken up, to ask of the Senate the appointment of a committee of inquiry, unless it should appear to him to be altogether unnecessary. One of our own Senators was compelled, by the urgency of his private business, to leave Washington before my nomination was disposed of, and as I had but little confidence in the fidelity of the professed friendship of the other, I was constrained to present my application to a Senator from another state. I was afterwards informed, that when it was acted upon, General Jackson and every other Senator present, was silent as to the imputations now made, no one presuming to question my honour or integrity. How can General Jackson justify it to his conscience or to his country, this palpable breach of his public duty? It is in vain to say that he gave a silent negative vote. He was in possession of information which, if true, must have occasioned the rejection of my nomination. It does not appear that any other Senator possessed the same information. Investigation was alike due to the purity of the National Councils, to me, and, as an act of strict justice, to all the other parties implicated. It is impossible for him to escape from the dilemma that he has been faithless, as a Senator of the United States, or has lent himself to the circulation of an atrocious calumny.

After the election, General Jackson was among the first who eagerly pressed his congratulations upon his successful rival. If Mr. Adams had been guilty of the employment of impure means to effect his election, General Jackson ought to have disclaimed to sully his own hands by touching those of his corrupt competitor.

On the 10th of February, 1825, the very next day after the election, General Jackson was invited to a public dinner at Washington, by some of his friends. He expressed to them his wish that he might be excused from accepting the invitation, because, alluding to the recent election, he said "any evidence of kindness and regard, such as you propose, might, by many, be viewed as conveying with it exception, murmuring, and feelings of complaint, which I sincerely hope belong to none of my friends." More than one month after the corrupt proposal is pretended to have been received, and after, according to the insinuation of General Jackson, a corrupt arrangement had been made between Mr. Adams and me—after the actual termination of an election, the issue of which was brought about, according to Gen. Jackson, by the basest of means, he was unwilling to accept the honours of a public dinner, lest it should imply even an exception against the result of the election.

General Jackson professes in his letter of the 6th of June—I quote again his words, "to have always intended, should Mr. Clay come out over his own signature, and deny having any knowledge of the communication made by his friends to my friends and to me, that I would give him the name of the gentleman through whom that communication came." He pretends never to have seen the Fayetteville letter, and yet the pretence of a denial under my signature is precisely that which had been urged by the principal editors who, sustain his cause. If this be an unconcealed, it is nevertheless a most wonderful coincidence. The General never communicated to me his professed intention, but left me in entire ignorance of his generous purpose; like the overture itself, it was profoundly concealed from me. There was an authorized denial from me, which went the circle of the public prints, immediately after the arrival at Washington of the Fayetteville letter. In that denial my words are given. They were contained in a letter dated at Washington City on the 18th day of April last, and are correctly stated to have been "that the statement—that his (my) friends had made such a proposition as the letter describes, to the friends of General Jackson was, as far as he knew or believed, utterly destitute of foundation; that he was unwilling to believe that General Jackson had made any such statement, but that no matter with whom it had originated; he was fully persuaded it was a gross fabrication, of the same calumnious character with the Kremer story, put forth for the double purpose of injuring his public character and propping the cause of General Jackson; and that for himself and for his friends, he defied the substantiation of the charge before any fair-tribunal whatever." Such were my own words transmitted in the form of a letter from a friend to a known person. Whereas the charge which they repelled was contained in a letter written by a person then unknown to some person also unknown. Did I not deny the charge under my own signature in my card of

the 31st January, 1825, published in the National Intelligencer? Was not there a substantial denial of it in my letter to Judge Brooke, dated the 28th of the same month? In my circular to my Constituents? In my Lawrenceburg Speech? And may I not add, in the whole tenor of my public life and conduct? If General Jackson had offered to furnish me the name of a member of Congress who was capable of advising his acceptance of a base and corrupt proposition, ought I to have reported to his infamous and discredited witness?

It has been a thousand times asserted and repeated, that I violated instructions which I ought to have obeyed. I deny the charge; and I am happy to have this opportunity to deny it in the presence of my assembled Constituents. The General Assembly requested the Kentucky delegation to vote in a particular way. A majority of that delegation, including myself, voted in opposition to that request. The legislature did not intend to give an imperative instruction. The distinction between a request and an instruction was familiar to the legislature; and their rolls attest that the former is always addressed to the members of the House of Representatives, and the latter only to the Senators of the United States. But I do not rely exclusively on this recognized distinction. I dispute, at once, the right of the legislature to issue a mandatory instruction to the Representatives of the people. Such a right has no foundation in the Constitution, in the reason or nature of things, nor in the usage of the Kentucky Legislature. Its exercise would be a manifest usurpation. The General Assembly has the incontrovertible right to express its opinion, and to proclaim its wishes, on any political subject whatever, and to such an expression great deference and respect are due; but it is not obligatory. The people, when, in August, 1825, they elected members to the General Assembly, did not invest them with any power to regulate or control the exercise of the discretion of the Kentucky Delegation in the Congress of the United States. I put it in the candour of every elector present, if he intended to part with his own right, or anticipated the exertion of any such power by the legislature, when he gave his vote in August, 1824.

The only instruction which I received from a legitimate source, emanated from a respectable portion of my immediate constituents; and that directed me to exercise my own discretion, regardless of the will of the legislature. You subsequently ratified my vote by unequivocal demonstrations, repeatedly given of your affectionate attachment and your unshaken confidence. You ratified it two years ago by the election of my personal and political friend (Judge Clarke) to succeed me in the House of Representatives, who had himself subscribed the only legitimate instruction which I received. You ratify it by the presence and the approbation of this vast and respectable assemblage.

I rejoice again and again, that the contest has at length assumed its present practical form. Heretofore, malignant whispers, and dark surmises, have been clandestinely circulated, or openly or unblushingly uttered, by irresponsible agents, like them, were invisible and intangible. No responsible man stood forward to sustain them, with his acknowledged authority. They have at last a local habitation and a name. General Jackson has now thrown off the mask, and comes confessedly forth from behind his concealed batteries, publicly to accuse and convict me. We stand confronted before the American people. Pronouncing the charges as I again do, destitute of all foundation, and gross aspersions, whether clandestinely or openly issued from the halls of the Capitol, the saloons of the Hermitage, or by press, by pen, or by tongue; and safely resting upon my conscious integrity, I demand the witness, and await the event with fearless confidence.

The issue is fairly joined. The imputed offence does not comprehend a single friend, but the collective body of my friends in Congress; and it accuses them of offering, and me with sanctioning, corrupt propositions, derogating from honour, and in violation of the most sacred of duties. The charge has been made after two years deliberation. General Jackson has voluntarily taken his position, and without provocation. In voting against him as President of the United States, I gave him no just cause of offence. I exercised no more than my indisputable privilege, as, on a subsequent occasion, of which I have never complained, he exercised his in voting against me as Secretary of State. Had I voted for him, I must have gone counter to every fixed principle of my public life. I believed him incompetent, and his election fraught with danger. At this early period of the Republic, keeping steady in