

RALEIGH REGISTER,

AND NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

"OURS ARE THE PLANS OF FAIR DELIGHTFUL PEACE, UNWARD BY PARTY RAGE, TO LIVE LIKE BROTHERS."

VOL. XXXII.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 1831.

NO. 41.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
By Joseph Gales & Son,
Raleigh, North-Carolina.

TERMS.

Three Dollars per annum, one half in advance. Those who do not, either at the time of subscribing, or subsequently, give notice of their wish to have the Paper discontinued at the expiration of their year, will be presumed as desiring its continuance until countermanded.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Not exceeding sixteen lines, will be inserted three times for a Dollar; and twenty-five cents for each subsequent publication; those of greater length, in the same proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

Agricultural.



The task of working improvement on the earth is much more delightful to an uneducated mind, than all the vain glory which can be acquired from ravaging it by the most unimpaired career of conquests. WASINGTON.

ON THE HORSE AND OX.

BY PRESIDENT MADISON.

I cannot but consider it as an error in our husbandry, that oxen are too little used in place of horses.

Every fair comparison of the expense of the two animals, favors a preference of the ox. But, the circumstance particularly recommending him, is that he can be supported when at work, by grass and hay; while the horse requires grain, and much of it, and the grain generally given him is Indian corn, the crop which requires most labor, and greatly exhausts the land.

From the best estimate I have been enabled to form, more than one half of the corn is consumed by horses, including the unground ones; and not less than one half, by other than pleasure horses. By getting free from this consumption, one half of the labor and of the wear of the land would be saved or rather more than one half. For on most farms, one half of the crop of corn grows on not more than two fifths, and sometimes a smaller proportion of the cultivated fields; and the more fertile fields would of course be retained for cultivation. Every one can figure to himself the ease and convenience of a revolution, which would so much reduce the extent of his cornfields; and substitute for the labor bestowed on them, the more easy task of providing pastureage and hay.

But will not the ox himself, when kept at labor, require grain food as well as the horse? Certainly much less, if any. Judging from my own observation I should say, that a plenty of good grass or good hay, will suffice without grain, where the labor is neither constant nor severe. But I feel entire confidence in saying, that a double set of oxen alternately at work, and therefore half the time at rest, might be kept in good plight without other food than a plenty of good grass or good hay. And as this double set would double the supply of beef, tallow and leather, a set off is found in that consideration for a double consumption of that kind of food.

The objections generally made to the ox, are, viz: 1. That he is less tractable than the horse. 2. That he does not bear heat as well. 3. That he does not answer for the single plough used in our cornfields. 4. That he is slower in his movements. 5. That he is less fit for carrying the produce of the farm to market.

The first objection is certainly founded in mistake. Of the two animals, the ox is the most docile. In all countries where the ox is the ordinary draught animal, his docility is proverbial. His intractability, where it exists, has arisen from an occasional use of him only with long and irregular intervals; during which, the habit of discipline being broken, a new one is to be formed.

The second objection has but very little foundation. The constitution of the ox accommodates itself, as readily as that of the horse, to different climates. Not only in ancient Greece and Italy, but throughout Asia, as presented to us in ancient history, the ox and the plough are associated. At this day, in the warm parts of India and China, the ox, not the horse, is in the draught service. In every part of India, the ox always appeared, even in the train of her armies. And in the hottest parts of the West Indies, the ox is employed in hauling the heavy produce to the sea ports. The mistake here, as in the former case, has arisen from the effects of occasional employment only, with no other than green food. The fermentation of this in the animal

heated by the weather, and fretted by discipline, will readily account for his sinking under his exertion; when green food even, much less dry, with a sober habit of labor, would have no such tendency.

The third objection also, is not a solid one. The ox can, by a proper harness, be used singly as well as the horse, between the rows of Indian corn; and equally so used for other purposes. Experience may be safely appealed to on this point.

In the fourth place, it is alleged that he is slower in his movements. This is true; but in a less degree than is often taken for granted. Oxen that are well chosen for their form, are not worked after the age of about eight years, (the age at which they are best fitted for beef), are not worked too many together, and are suitably matched, may be kept to nearly as quick a step as the horse. May I not say, a step quicker than that of many horses we see at work, who, on account of their age or the leanness occasioned by the costliness of the food they require, lose the advantage where they might have once had it!

The last objection has most weight. The ox is not so well adapted as the horse to the road service, especially for long trips. In common roads, which are often soft, and sometimes suddenly become so, the form of his foot and the shortness of his leg, are disadvantages; and on roads frozen or turpined, the roughness of the surface in the former case, and its harshness in both cases, are inconvenient to his cloven hoof. But where the distance to market is not great, where the varying state of the roads and of the weather, can be consulted; and where the road service is in less proportion to the farm service, the objection, is almost deprived of its weight. In cases where it most applies, its weight is diminished by the consideration, that a much greater proportion of service on the farm may be done by oxen, than is now commonly done; and that the expense of shoeing them, is little different from that of keeping horses shod. It is observable, that when oxen are worked on a farm, over rough frozen ground, they suffer so much for the want of shoes, however well fed they may be, that it is a proper subject for calculation, whether true economy does not require for them that accommodation, even on the farm, as well as for the horse.

A more important calculation is—whether in many situations, the general saving by substituting the ox for the horse would not balance the expense of hiring the carriage of the produce to market. In the same scale with the hire, is to be put the value of the grass and hay consumed by the oxen; and in the other scale, the value of the corn, amounting to one half of the crop, and of the grass and hay consumed by the horses. Where the market is not distant, the value of the corn would certainly pay for the carriage of the market portion of the crop, and balance moreover, any difference between the value of the grass and hay consumed by oxen, and the value of the oxen when slaughtered for beef. In all these calculations, it is doubtless proper not to lose sight of the rule, that farmers ought to avoid paying others for doing what they can do for themselves. But the rule has its exceptions: and the error, if it be committed, will lie not in departing from the rule, but in not selecting aright the cases which call for the departure. It may be remarked, that the rule ought to be more or less general, as there may be, or may not be at hand a market by which every produce of labor is convertible into money. In the old countries, this is much more the case than in new; and in new, much more the case near towns, than at a distance from them. In this as in most other parts of our country, a change of circumstances is taking place, which renders every thing raised on a farm more convertible into money than formerly; and as the change proceeds, it will be more and more a point for consideration, how far the labor in doing what might be bought could earn more in another way, than the amount of the purchase. Still it will always be prudent, for reasons which every experienced farmer will understand, to lean to the side of doing rather than hiring or buying what may be wanted.

The mule seems to be in point of economy, between the ox and the horse, preferable to the latter, and inferior to the former; but so well adapted to particular services, that he may find a proper place on many farms. He is liable to the objection which weighs more against the ox. He is less fitted than the horse for road service.

POLITICS OF THE DAY.

From the National Intelligencer.

Blue Spring, 2d August, 1831.
Messrs. Gales & Son: After having finished the within letter, I discovered in your paper of the 23d ult. that Mr. Johnson has just published his letter to me, as well as his statement. You will please, therefore to publish this letter as my reply, and oblige your ob't servant.
R. H. M. JOHNSON.

Blue Spring, July 31, 1831.

Dear Sir: Yours of the 16th inst. was this day received, accompanied by a statement, which, it seems, you have prepared for the Public, purporting to contain separate conversations, with the President & myself, relative to an allegation made in the public journals, that General Jackson had authorized a Member of Congress to require of Messrs. Berrien, Branch and yourself, and your families to associate with Major Eaton and his family, under the penalty of being dismissed from office. You refer to two articles in the Globe to justify your appeal to the public, previously to receiving my answer, in which it appeared that I had denied the above allegation, if it had any allusion to me. After the publication of this accusation against General Jackson, I received a letter from a friend, intimating that I was the member of Congress to whom allusion was made, and requested to know if I had ever made such a communication. In my answer, I confined myself to the specific accusation thus publicly made against the President, and which is attributable to yourself, & most unequivocally denied that Gen. Jackson ever made such a requisition through me, and as positively denied having ever made such a statement to you. On the contrary, I asserted, and now repeat, I did inform you, in each and every interview, that the President disclaimed any right or intention to interfere in any manner whatever with the regulation of your private or social intercourse.

Thus, in a matter in which I was engaged to serve you and other friends, in a matter of a delicate and highly confidential nature, and in which I succeeded, unexpectedly I found myself presented in the public journals as a witness impeaching one of those friends, and ascribing to him declarations which he never made; and placed in that attitude by you, self-respect and self-defence called upon me to correct that erroneous statement. I cannot, therefore, agree with you, that I did in any degree change my view of the subject in considering it improper in any of the parties to come before the public without the opportunity of comparing our different recollections. But if you feel under any obligations of a personal or political character to come before the public previously, you will find me as ready as yourself to meet any responsibility or difficulty which such a course may produce. Up to this date I have considered my correspondence with you and Mr. Berrien of a character not to be divulged to any one, and have therefore confined it to my own bosom. The object of my first letter to you was to declare frankly and candidly in the spirit of perfect respect and friendship, that I was misunderstood, provided I was the member of Congress to whom reference was made, that you might have it in your power to correct your misapprehension of my communications.

I did not see how it could impeach your character or lessen your reputation to consider and acknowledge it a mistake, without your assumption of the ground that you understood me better than I understood myself, and that you could make the public believe so. My standard of confidence and friendship, arising from a personal and political intimacy of twenty years, would have dictated that course to me. Such a course could have been injurious to none, and less troublesome to all. But, so far as I am concerned, I feel perfectly willing to take the course adopted by yourself, of placing our views before the public. I do not, however, think that it will be much benefited by our labors; and I am farther induced to believe that the people will place a less value upon the controversy than you do.

In denying the confidential character of our conversations, you urge, as one consideration, that the information to invite Maj. Eaton and his family to your large parties was offensive, although you are kind enough to believe that I did not so intend it? If the nature of the suggestion changed in your mind the character of the conversation, and the relation of that perfect friendship which had so long existed, would it not have been magnanimous and generous in you to have advised me of it? I come now to the material point in controversy—whether Gen. Jackson, through me, required of you to invite Maj. Eaton and his family to your large parties. This suggestion was made upon my own responsibility, with an anxious desire more effectually to reconcile the then existing difficulties. But Gen. Jackson never did make such a requisition, in any manner whatever, directly or indirectly; nor did I ever intimate to you that he had made such a demand. The complaint made by Gen. Jackson against this part of his Cabinet was specific, that he had been informed and was induced to believe that they were using their influence to have Maj. Eaton and his family excluded from all respectable circles, for the purpose of degrading him, and thus drive him from office; and that the attempt had been made even upon the foreign ministers, and in one case had produced the desired effect. He proposed no mode of accommodation or satisfaction, but declared expressly that if such was the fact he would dismiss them from office. He then read to me a paper containing the principles

upon which he intended to act, which disclaimed the right to interfere with the social relations of his cabinet. Acting in the capacity of a mutual friend, and obeying the impulse of my own mind, can it be supposed that I would have misrepresented any of the parties, and thus defeat the object I had in view? I should have considered it a gross violation of the ties of that friendship which then existed between us, to have carried to you such a message, as that you should invite Maj. Eaton and his family, or any other persons, to your large or small parties, under a menace of office. When the President mentioned this charge of conspiracy, I vindicated you against it. I gave it as my opinion that he was misinformed. To prevent a rupture, I requested the President to postpone calling upon those members of his Cabinet till Saturday, that I might have the opportunity of two days to converse with them.

When I made my report to the President, I informed him that I was confirmed in my opinion previously expressed, that he had been misinformed as to the combination and conspiracy. I informed him of your unequivocal and positive denial of the fact, and communicated every thing which transpired between us calculated to satisfy his mind on the subject. It was this report of mine that gave him satisfaction, and changed his feelings and determinations—not his ground as you have supposed; with me he had no ground to change. He had assumed none except that which I have stated; nor did I ever make use of such an expression to you that he had changed his ground. It is true that I informed you that the President was very much excited, but I do not now recollect the precise language used to convey my idea of that excitement. I presume you had the advantage of your private memoranda, when you say I compared him to a roaring Lion.

You attribute to me another declaration, which I never made—that on our way to Mr. Berrien's I stated that the President had informed me that he would invite Mr. Branch, Mr. Berrien, and yourself, to meet him on the next Friday, when he would inform you of his determination in the presence of Dr. Ely. I never received or communicated such an idea.

The paragraph is substantially correct when that part in reference to Dr. Ely is expunged.

It is true, in some of our various conversations, the name of Dr. Ely was mentioned, but in connection with another part of the subject. The President informed me that when the rumors against Maj. Eaton and his family had been opened to him by Dr. Ely, he had invited the accusers to make good their charges, and that they had failed—this is the substance of that part of our conversation in which Dr. Ely's name was mentioned. Again, you say I called at your house about 6 o'clock, when we walked to Mr. Berrien's. The fact is that you called for me at my lodgings about two time by a previous appointment. This is a mistake in a matter of fact of no great importance, except to show how easily we forget. If we thus differ in matters of fact, how much more liable to differ as to words; and still more as to the time, manner, and circumstances in which these words have been introduced; and still more as to the precise meaning the speaker wishes to convey to the hearer!

Having thought it important to memorandum our conversation would it not have given additional proof of your friendship and confidence, and would it not have been an act of justice to me, to have furnished me with it. (so far as I am concerned,) that I might have, corrected, if necessary, any erroneous impressions which my conversations may have made upon you? The witness in court is often misunderstood by lawyers and jury, and as often called upon to correct the mistake and to explain his meaning; and you have gained little, in your desire to be accurate, so far as I am concerned, by failing to present me with your private memoranda; and if now furnished, I dare think that I might put a different construction upon your own notes.

Again: you are incorrect in supposing that I informed you that the President requested me to converse with you and your colleagues. It was my own proposition; and in this you will find I am supported by Mr. Berrien. Nor did I ever say that your families had not returned the call of Mrs. Eaton; and that if they would leave the first card, and open a formal intercourse in that way, the President would be satisfied. Such an idea never entered my mind; for I never did know the precise manner in which the social non-intercourse existed between your families, whether cards had ever passed from either or not; and sure I am that the President & myself never had any conversation on the subject. From first to last my efforts were put forth to reconcile the parties concerned; they were for the time being successful. I have never claimed any merit for what I did: I felt happy, however, that I was in any way instrumental in prolonging the political relations which have since been severed, in which I have had no agency, and which I deeply regretted. Having thus acted, to my great mortification I find myself dragged before the public to vindicate myself against sentiments and conversations imputed to me by a part of those friends, without the opportunity of explaining to them their misapprehension of what I did say.

Without adverting to any farther inaccuracies of your letter and statement, I have the honor to be very respectfully, your ob't servt.
R. H. M. JOHNSON.

cation I find myself dragged before the public to vindicate myself against sentiments and conversations imputed to me by a part of those friends, without the opportunity of explaining to them their misapprehension of what I did say.

Without adverting to any farther inaccuracies of your letter and statement, I have the honor to be very respectfully, your ob't servt.
R. H. M. JOHNSON.

Hon. SAMUEL D. INGHAM.

CLOSE OF THE LIFE OF BURNS.

Robert Burns, the sweetest poet of Scotland, died at Dumfries, on the 21st of July, 1796, in the 38th year of his age. The admiration in which he was held by his neighbors and countrymen, is shown by an interesting account of his last hours and of his funeral, as given by Allen Cunningham.

"Dumfries was like a besieged place. It was known he was dying, and the anxiety, not of the rich and the learned only, but of the mechanics and peasants, exceeded all belief. Whenever two or three people stood together, their talk was of Burns, and of him alone. They spoke of his person, of his works, of his family, of his fame, and of his untimely & approaching fate, with a warmth and an enthusiasm which will forever endear Dumfries to my remembrance. All that he said or was saying, was easily caught up and reported from street to street & from house to house."

"His good humor was unruffled, & his wit never forsook him. He looked at one of his fellow volunteers with a smile, as he stood by the bedside with his eyes wet, and said, 'John, don't let the awkward squad fire over me.' He repressed with a smile the hopes of his friends, and told them he had lived long enough. As his life drew near a close, the eager, yet doleful solicitude of his townsmen increased. His differences with them on some important points were forgotten and forgiven; they thought only of his genius—the delight his compositions had diffused—and they talked of him with the same awe as of some departing spirit, whose voice was to gladden them no more."

"I went to see him laid out for the grave; several elder people were with me. He lay in a plain unadorned coffin, with a linen sheet drawn over his face; and on the bed, and around the body, herbs and flowers were thickly strewn, according to the usage of the country. He was wasted somewhat by long illness, but death had not increased the swarthy hue of his face, which was uncommonly dark and deeply marked. His broad and open brow was pale and serene, and around it his sable hair lay in masses, slightly touched with grey. We stood and gazed on him in silence for the space of several minutes—we went and others succeeded us—not a whisper was heard. This was several days after his death."

"The multitude who accompanied Burns to the grave, went step by step with the chief mourners. They might amount to ten or twelve thousand. Not a word was heard. It was an impressive and mournful sight to see men of all ranks and persuasions & opinions mingling as brothers, and stepping side by side down the streets of Dumfries, with the remains of him who had sung of their loves and joys and domestic endearments, with a truth and a tenderness which none perhaps have equalled."

CHOLERA MORBUS.

The N. Y. Mercantile has favored its readers with a letter from the London Times, written by a Mr. Thomas Hope, Surgeon in the British Navy, on the subject of the Cholera Morbus. It is said to have taken unusual pains to collect information. He states that "the disease shows itself at first by violent pains from stricture of the gall duct, & is afterwards kept up by the irritability of the bowels, brought on by the excretion of the intestinal coat, from the acrid or scalding nature of the bile when first expelled the gall bag. This irritation keeps up the disease till nature recovers or sinks."

"I never use calomel (says Dr. Hope) because I have a more certain, safe and speedy remedy, that produces an almost instantaneous relief; calomel relieves by inducing a more copious secretion of mucus to defend the membrane from excessive irritation, where it succeeds; whilst the remedy I recommend affords a tone of firmness to the membrane—a smoothness of surface that defends it from the action of the bile, and removes excessive irritation, by which means the disease goes off as soon as the gall-bladder is emptied of its excessive irritative contents, which is very soon accomplished, as from three to five or six doses completes the cure; the following is one of the proofs of my assertion:

"I was surgeon of the Dolphin in the year 1825; between the 17th and 26th of July in that year, I had 254 cases of Cholera Morbus, from which, with the exception of sixteen being kept under treatment for fifteen days, four patients demanded attention for four days, and three for five days, every patient was restored in 50

hours; one who had been previously ill demanded longer attention.

"I persuaded the chief mate to take a dose of the remedy before the healthy remaining part of the ship's company, to induce them to follow his example; they all complied; and to the best of my recollection, not one of them had occasion to trouble me from illness.

"The remedy I gave was—One drachm of nitrous acid, (not nitric, that has spoiled me,) one ounce of peppermint water, or camphor mixture, and 40 drops of tincture of opium. A fourth part every three or four hours in a cup full of thin gruel. The body should be covered with a succession of hot cloths dry; bottles of hot water to the feet, if they can be obtained; constant and small sippings of finely strained thin gruel, or sago, or tapioca; no spirit—no wine—no fermented liquors till quite restored."

From the Alexandria Gazette.

POLAND.

To this gallant, chivalrous and noble country, we look with feelings of enthusiasm kindled by their brave exploits in defence of their rights and liberties. There is every thing in their cause to excite the sensibilities of a generous heart. With justice on their side, they war against tyranny and oppression. Single handed and alone, they contend against the collected hordes of a vast empire—poor and needy, they keep up a contest with the most powerful monarch in Europe. Their soldiers are brave—their women patriotic—their priests martyrs for their country. How noble in sentiment is the address of their distinguished chief to the Lithuanians! He exhorts them to action, but holds out no false hopes of bloodless victory, and easy campaigns.

"Abandon (says he) your houses, your fortunes; abandon every thing that has been most dear to you, crowd together to secure the first of blessings—the independence of our country."

"But let us not deceive ourselves. For the future, severe labor and sanguinary contests await us; we have to contend with a powerful enemy; his forces are prodigious—the extent of his domains great."

"The contest will be terrible and arduous; but recollect that providence grants strength to union, that it grants victory to courage and perseverance, let his name be invoked as the *Agis* of our holy cause, and let us seek aid from him and consolation in religion."

With what a soul-stirring eloquence too, does the National Congress address the nation!

"God has already wrought prodigies for us. God, and not the Emperor of Russia, will be our judge! He will decide."

"He will decide who has committed perjury, who has been the victim of oppression, and who ought to obtain the victory. We have already fought with success in the name of the God of our fathers, and we will fight until at length we have accomplished the ends of justice. All the nations of Europe possessed with the feelings of humanity tremble for our fate, and exult with joy at our success. These only wait your general rising to hail you as members of the free and independent nations of Europe."

"Brethren and fellow-citizens! when we shall have finished this terrible and unequal contest, we will invite the powers of Europe to form themselves into a tribunal of justice; we will appear before them covered with our blood, lay open the book of our annals, unroll the chart of Europe, and say—Behold our cause and yours! The injustice done to Poland is known to you; you behold her despair;—for her courage and generosity appear to her enemies!"

"Brethren let us hope in God. We will inspire the breasts of our judges, who inspired by eternal justice will say—Long live Poland! free and independent!"

And is such a nation again to fall unwept without a crime? Is Poland no longer to have a name among the nations of the earth? Is she to be blotted out from existence, and her fields fattened with the heart's blood of her gallant people, to be tillled by the serfs and slaves of a Russian Autocrat?—Forbid it Heaven! In such a case, we cease to calculate or indulge in cold speculations of State policy—

"The cause the cause—it is the cause, my soul!"

Why will not gallant France succour the land of Kosciusko? Why will not emerald England interpose to save freedom and civilization, the remnant of a people long having over and over again, shown movements of undying attachment to national freedom, and independence? It is for them, answer. Theirs might be the glory—may be the disgrace. After ages will whether the most enlightened nations Europe, in 1831, permitted the down of Poland, struggling with the most heroic efforts for LIBERTY.

REGISTER OFFICE
NEXT DOOR, SOUTH OF COURT-HOUSE.