



THE GAZETTE.

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1831.

From the Western Sun.

To the Editor of the Vincennes Gazette.

SIR.—In your paper of the 12th instant you say that my circular to my constituents, is given in that day's paper, and promised some remarks on my letter "a man." In the next number of your partisan paper, you have labored with your own pen and by extracts from the writings of other political partisans, to induce the people of this Congressional district, to believe that it is just and right, that they should pay a direct tax of three cents for each and every pound of New Orleans sugar, which their necessities may require them to purchase; but in vain will you labor to divert public opinion from the true state of things, merely to answer party purposes.

You, Mr. Hill, have made your paper the vehicle of misrepresentation, by giving to the public a garbled statement of my circular—leaving out such parts of it as suited your purpose, and to render its meaning perfectly ridiculous, in more than one part of it. You have not given those words in italics, that are so given by me; and you have given other words in italics that were not so given by me.

You ask why I omitted to inform my constituents in Knox and Daviess, and the other adjoining counties, the cause of the defeat of an appropriation for the improvement of the great western mail route from Louisville to St. Louis. The answer is at hand—Gen. Duncan of Illinois and myself used our best efforts to effect this desirable object; but a majority of the house were not disposed to act upon it at that time.

Will you be so good as to inform the public through the columns of your paper, why this object was not effected under the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay? And why there was not as much money appropriated for the construction of the Cumberland road within the state of Indiana, under the late administration, aided by the influence of my honorable and talented predecessor in Congress, as has been appropriated for that object, under the present administration? Answer that Mr. Hill—And then tell the people if you can, into the belief that Gen. Jackson is opposed to a well regulated system of internal improvement—I won't do. I have thought it my duty to say this much in self defense—and I now take my leave of you for the present, and submit to a candid public, how far your publications should influence the public mind.

R. BOON.

Boonville, March 22d, 1831.

Drawing a reasonable conclusion from the above, it is evident that Mr. Boon is very indignant at my remarks on his Sugar vote, and endeavors to avoid a scrutiny by referring to matters of very trifling import. But this will not avail. The people of the first Congressional district, and particularly those who are located about the Wabash and White rivers, have discrimination enough to perceive the cloven-footed evasion. As to his epithets, they pass unheeded—I disdain to retaliate—but let me say to Mr. Boon, that the man who is formed to discharge high duties, never considers persons; his views should be directed to measures, their weight, and consequences.

We are living in a republic, and have a right, which we inherit from our constitution and which we enjoy as freemen, to watch narrowly and censure freely, those servants of the people who err in duty to their constituents; who have been weighed in the balance and found wanting.—As one of the people, and as the conductor of a public journal, my sentiments have been freely and candidly given—yet Mr. Boon, it appears, is outrageous at the assurance of an individual who dares both censure and condemn part of his political course. So much for his republican principles!

The gentleman is extremely abundant in his compliments to my "partisan paper." Pray, does he know the meaning of the word "partisan?" If he does, so much the worse for his character as a man of sense—if he does not, he is advised to refer to his lexicon for its signification, particularly as he is so tenacious respecting the right use of words, and the very letter in which they should be printed. If a humble defender of the rights and liberties of the people—a supporter of Internal Improvements and Domestic Manufactures—a warm advocate for the poor man who endeavors to obtain a fair price for his little crop of corn, (the real value of which would be reduced by the policy urged by Mr. Boon,) he called a partisan, then am I one.

I aver that the charges made in the first paragraph of his letter are untrue.—Mr. Boon must establish the matter. If he choose to persist in advocating the duty on Sugar, I will satisfy every reader, of the truth of my declarations, and pledge myself to refute every pretext the gentleman may allege in opposition. I never admitted, directly or indirectly, that a duty levied on foreign products operated as a tax; but precisely the reverse. No man of sense (except a few southern Nullifiers) can be induced to believe that a protection of our own products operates otherwise than as an encouragement to industry. Since the Tariff of 1824, every article it embraced has fallen in price, just in the proportion of the duty exacted from foreigners. But it seems Mr. Boon has yet to learn and understand the domestic economy of the Union. His want of discernment has placed him in rather an unpleasant situation.

The article following this, headed "Mr. Boon's Circular," and copied from the Terre Haute Register, is so clear and complete in regard to the Sugar vote, that it is adopted in order to supersede the necessity of saying any more on this point at present. Another article is also given headed "Duty on Sugar"—a perusal of this will remove every possible doubt on the subject. Now, until Mr. Boon meets the facts I have heretofore published—the report of Mr. Dickerson in the Senate of the United States, and the reasoning therein contained—he may indeed "divert" public opinion by the ridiculous position he must occupy in the view of every intelligent voter—and from his persisting to advocate the course which he has pursued, he must be considered as his own accuser, and his own evidence.—His sentence will in due time be pronounced by the people.

In his second paragraph, he accuses me of "misrepresentation," "garbled statements of his circular," &c. As to the charge of wilfully "leaving out such parts of his letter as suited my purposes," it is false. I leave it to the people—aye, the sovereigns of the gentleman—to judge of the wonderful difference between his circular as it appeared in the Western Sun, and as published in the Vincennes Gazette, (for although I have made search, I cannot find an original copy of his valuable circular in the town.)

On a critical examination, I discover that the errors now noticed are to be found in my paper. I regret it much, as they were caused by carelessness and inattention; but had Mr. Boon informed me of the circumstance, they should have been noted the succeeding week. There is, however, but one important error in the whole impression. It is contained in this sentence, "The speedy payment of the public debt, should be the first object of the real friends of internal improvement and of those who do not believe that a national debt is a national blessing." In the Gazette, the words "do not" were accidentally omitted. In another paragraph, an unimportant error occurs—the words "per acre" are omitted; and for the third and last error, the word "now" is added. The sentence in the Gazette reads thus—"nor am I now less disposed to avow my political sentiments than on any former occasion."—In the Western Sun, it reads thus—"nor am I less disposed to avow my political sentiments than on any former occasion." What a wonderful difference!! Dominic Sampson would say to this charge—*Fro-di-ous!!*

Mr. Boon says, also, I "have given words in italic that were not so given by him." Now, I wish the people (and they would confer a favor by doing so) to take up both papers, the Sun and the Gazette, and judge of the truth of this charge. They will perceive that in my paper ten words are italicized, and that the very same words are printed in italic by his friend Mr. Stout. There is really something so puerile in this accusation that it is almost unworthy of notice.

It seems the Colonel speaks in "self defense"—From the tenor of his letter I should judge that every thing was "self" with him. Away with such selfishness! Let not our best and dearest interests be sacrificed on the altar of Party. Let us elect men to serve us, who are really zealous for the welfare of the community—and who will advocate such measures as will protect Home Industry.

leave the gentleman in the hands of my friend Mr. Stout, to whom, I believe, a circular was addressed.

So much for "misrepresentation," "garbling," &c. The truth is, and every one can perceive it, that the gentleman is alarmed, and is endeavoring to avoid a discussion of his Sugar vote—he is, therefore, ready to resort to any pretext, in order to be released from this heavy responsibility. Perhaps he begins to fear his views and opinions must annihilate his pretensions, and wishes to remain silent on the subject. He should, however, remember that if he does not defend the position he has taken, the people "will not hold him guiltless."

I asked Mr. Boon "why he omitted in his circular to give information on the subject of the great Western Mail route from Louisville to St. Louis?" He says "the answer is at hand." Gen. Duncan and himself used efforts to effect the object, but a majority of the House were not disposed to act upon it at that time. Now, this is no answer to the enquiry. We have no claim on the attentions of Gen. Duncan. If one effort failed, why not make another? Why not try again, when the House might be differently disposed? I fear it was the *retro* doctrine that caused its defeat. A road that has peopled States and Territories, and is, and must ever be, of so much consequence as the road hence to Louisville, has a prior claim to many others annually provided for.

Mr. Boon desires to know "why this road was not provided for under the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay," (by the bye this is the first time that I ever heard, read, or understood, that Mr. Clay had been President of the United States,) and why the National Road within this state had not as much money appropriated for it under the late administration as under the present? He triumphantly says, "Answer that Mr. Hill.—The answer is at hand." The reason why the road hence to Louisville was not provided for under the administration of Mr. Adams, does not, nor can it, save Mr. Boon. No bill that I ever heard of passed the Senate for this purpose during the Presidency of Mr. Adams, but a bill has passed the Senate since appropriating Eighteen Thousand Dollars for this object. Why has this appropriation slept on the table of the House of which Mr. Boon was a member, when other appropriations of much less national interest have been allowed? But this man would endeavor to lead the people of the district astray, and foist on them an appropriation to the National Road! This is *too much*. Not one mile of the National Road (so called) passes through the counties of Knox, Daviess, Martin, or Orange—and what is more the amount appropriated to this National road is to be refunded to the Treasury of the United States, under the compact authorizing us to form a state Government. It is the National Road was only located and ready for any expenditure when Gen. Jackson was contending for the Presidency. The gentleman cannot induce the people to believe, that he has been in any way instrumental in advancing the National Road; and, as I said before, the appropriation for our Louisville Road must rest upon quite different ground.

Mr. Boon says General Jackson is not opposed to a well regulated system of Internal Improvements. Indeed!! Why his veto? Why any opposition on the part of his followers? Why the delay of an appropriation on the Louisville Road? Under the administration of Mr. Adams, Indiana was liberally served. The land for the Wabash and Erie Canal—the land for the Michigan Road, and all that appeared wanting at the time was furnished.

It seems the Colonel speaks in "self defense"—From the tenor of his letter I should judge that every thing was "self" with him. Away with such selfishness! Let not our best and dearest interests be sacrificed on the altar of Party. Let us elect men to serve us, who are really zealous for the welfare of the community—and who will advocate such measures as will protect Home Industry.

MR. BOON'S CIRCULAR.

Remarks on Mr. Boon's circular, from the Terre Haute Register.

We copy Mr. Boon's circular from the Western Sun. He is entitled to credit for his frankness, in enabling his constituents to judge of the correctness or error of his views. We have neither leisure nor room to enter into a full discussion of the sentiments set forth in this document, but cannot forbear remarking on Mr. Boon's vote? But on this point I

from the reduction of duties on coffee, tea, &c. to what it was prior to the reduction of the duties upon them. A twelve-month having elapsed, and no reduction having taken place in the price of these commodities, we think bears strong testimony in favor of the doctrine that duties on these articles did not operate as a *tax* upon our citizens, but rather as a wholesome source of revenue to our national treasury, which has been very injuriously thrown into the pockets of foreigners, who well know how to speculate upon our necessities, and profit by our currency.

The idea that the duty on sugar operates as a *tax*, and should be done away, to us seems still more novel. The price of that article now being from 6 to 7 cents per pound, by the way, in commercial towns, certainly evinces a reduction in its price, since the duty of foreign sugar has been imposed. If the duty is a *tax*, remove it, and the price of sugar must bear a correspondent reduction, three cents on the pound; which would place it from three and a half to four cents per pound. Does Mr. Boon present any testimony that this would be the result? Instead of the price of coffee, having fallen in a corresponding ratio, to the reduction of duty upon it, its former price is still sustained. There were no cultivators of that article in this country, to be ruined; no sources of home supply to be dried up by the reduction of the duty upon it. The same competition in this branch of commerce now exists, that did exist previous to the reduction of the duties. Would it be the same in the event of the reduction of the duty on sugar? Or would the planters of the south be compelled to turn their means and attention to other branches of agriculture, and thus strike from existence all sources of American competition in the production of sugar, the main source of a home supply? Would this have a tendency to reduce the price of the article? or would it divest us of that independence of foreign nations, for a supply of this necessary, which has been conferred upon our country by the patriotic planters of Louisiana? Divest them of this protection; sacrifice the capital they have invested, to a mistaken policy and foreign credibility; depend upon commerce, and invite foreign monopoly; and divest of the market it now affords us for the products of western industry, we have no doubt that the effects would be more generally *felt* by all classes of our citizens, than any act of congress, passed by any former administration for many years.

But like Mr. B. we omit saying whether *beneficially* or *injurious* *felt*, leaving our fellow citizens to decide this point according to their own convictions. We are of the opinion, that had the amount which would have accrued to the national treasury, from the duties on coffee, tea, salt, &c. consumed in this district, been employed in *reducing* the obstructions to the navigation of our rivers, it would have had a more certain tendency to lessen the price of these articles than the reduction of duties themselves; and the great benefits we should have derived from the facilities thus obtained in the transmission of produce and importation of supplies, at all seasons, would far outweigh all the "impositions" that can be added which our worthy representative evinces such great solicitude to guard the *farmers* and *mechanics* of our country against. We may be in error, but we have our doubts that Mr. Boon would be willing to risk his eight dollars per day, in guaranteeing to his constituents a corresponding declension in the *price of sugar*, to the reduction of the duty upon that article, were it to take effect at the next session of congress. We agree with Mr. Boon, that internal improvement, like other subjects of legislation, may be brought into dispute, by any attempt to carry the measure beyond the means to sustain it. We can see no surer policy to divest this nation of the means to sustain this great system, than by lopping off the sources of revenue, and prostrating the great branches of her agricultural & manufacturing resources.

The want of room admonishes us to postpone further remarks.

The foregoing intelligent and cogent remarks fully expose the course of proceeding, on the part of Mr. Boon, by which the general prosperity of the country would be utterly destroyed, and internal improvement every where retarded. I will here, for once, adopt the words of the gentleman, and say "Answer that," Mr. Boon.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

To throw more light on the injudicious vote of Mr. Boon, I submit to my readers the subjoined extracts from a letter on the sugar duty, published in the National Intelligencer.

"I had no adequate conception, prior to my visit to this state, of the dependence of the Louisiana planter upon other states, for his necessary supplies. He derives them from his flour, bacon, pork, beef, the greater part of the Indian corn fed upon his plantation, his clothing and shoes for himself and his slaves, his carts, axes, spades, hoes, ploughs, steamengines for his sugar house, stone coal, horses, mules, cattle, hogs, whiskey, and a great variety of other articles. These are obtained principally from Pennsylvania, and the western, middle, and northern states; whilst his slaves, annually in great numbers, are brought from Virginia and Maryland. You will readily conceive what a vast amount of tonnage must be engaged on the sea and on the rivers, in transporting mutual productions of this valuable trade.

Let us suppose the market for these various objects to be suddenly cut off, the inevitable consequence of the repeal of the duty on sugar, and I am not correct in saying, that every part of the union would be deeply and sensibly affected in this view of the subject. Every article which I have enumerated would immediately fall in price, and no section of the union would be altogether exempt from the consequences of a measure so disastrous.

Would there be a compensation in the permanent reduction of the price of sugar, the illusive object sought by those who, in aiming to repeal the duty, would lay the axe at the root of the prosperity of this interesting state? It is confidently believed not. The present low price of sugar, which has been gradually declining until it has reached a point of depression, which scarcely admits of its continued production, is attributable to the competition which has arisen between the West Indian and Louisiana planter. The 80 or 100,000 hogsheads, which the latter throws into the general consumption, has diminished to that extent, the demand for the produce of the former, who has been consequently compelled to reduce the price. This has obliged the Louisiana planter also to reduce the price, and he has found him self only sustained by the possession of the home market, the principal part of which is secured to him by the existing duty. But the effect of a repeal of the duty would be to compel the Louisiana planter to relinquish the cultivation of the sugar cane. Absolute ruin would befall him if he persevered in it. Then what would happen? The 80 or 100,000 hogsheads now contributed by Louisiana, would be withdrawn from the general consumption. A demand would ensue for 80 or 100,000 hogsheads more of the production of the West Indies. This demand would speedily augment

the price, and the probability is, that it would mount higher, for a while, than it now is, and finally sink down to about the present rate.

It is evident, then, that the Louisiana planter, if he were not protected by the existing duty, could not sustain a competition with the sugar of foreign colonies. They enjoy a monopoly of the consumption of their respective parent countries, possess a climate much better adapted to the culture of the cane than this, and have other advantages. The *repeal* of the duty would be destructive to the Louisiana planter, and almost as fatal in its consequence as if Congress were to order the dykes to be razed to the level of the adjacent land from Point Coupee to the Belize.

But if the National Legislature, after having by its uniform course of policy, during long series of years, inspired full confidence in the inhabitants of this State as to the permanency of protection, and invited them to invest their capital in their present pursuit, could bring itself to overwhelm them in irretrievable ruin, their sufferings would not be confined to themselves, but would extend to every other part of the Union.

If manufactures, in any country, deserve protection be cause of the home market which they create for the production of the industry of other classes, the sugar planter of Louisiana is equally entitled, for the same reason, to its benefit. The seven or eight hundred sugar plantations in Louisiana are, in fact, but seven or eight hundred great manufactures. The raw material is, it is true, produced on their plantations by the cultivation of the earth, but it is only produced to be there manufactured also into sugar and molasses. As extensive consumers of the objects of the industry of other classes, the Louisiana planters are even more important than manufacturers, exclusively engaged in fabrication; for they neither make their food nor their clothing, nor their implements of labor, all of which they purchase from other States. Nay, more; their very laborers themselves, in consequence of the institution of slavery, are chiefly brought from the other States. Manufacturers, strictly so called, on the contrary, either make their own cloths or their implements of labor, of both."

It will be perceived on a reference to the first page of this paper, that the people of Louisville are taking measures for the formation of a Lyceum, in that city. Such associations are very common in the New England states; but as the principles on which these institutions are founded are but partially known in the west, the essay is inserted in order to give a majority of our citizens some idea of the value and utility of these schools. Why could not one of a similar nature be formed in Vincennes?

A communication signed "A VOTER," shall have a place next week.

I am authorised to announce JOSEPH CHAMBERS as a candidate for the next legislature.

I am also authorised to announce SPENCER YOUNG as a candidate for the legislature.

TO THE PUBLIC.

A misrepresentation has already gone abroad, and no doubt will extend itself, relative to a judgment lately obtained in the Knox circuit court, against James Johnson, myself, and others, on a charge of having applied "Lynch's law" in order to extort confessions from one David Ewing, charged with stealing a horse at Evansville, shortly after his return from a tour in the penitentiary. I feel it a duty which I owe to myself, to request the public to suspend all opinion on that subject, until the proper time arrives for a full development of facts to be laid before them. As the subject will probably hereafter undergo further judicial investigation, that time has consequently not yet arrived; but I hope I may be permitted to request editors of newspapers, who have, (at the request of some friend, to me unknown,) announced my name as a candidate for congress, to publish the following certificates of Capt. Barnhart and Major Warner, in order that the force of misrepresentation, and prejudice consequently engendered thereby, may be arrested in its further progress. This circumstance has already done me much injury, in a pecuniary point of view. It may yet reduce me to indigence and want; but this consideration is to me but chaff, compared with the destruction of that reputation which I have labored to establish and sustain, in this country, for the last twenty-six years. "Who steals my purse steals trash—'twas mine—'tis his, and has been slave to thousands. But he who filches from me my good name, robs me of that which, not enriches him, but makes me poor indeed."

Editors who feel for the cause of justice and an injured individual, will please insert this together with the accompanying certificates.

And oblige,

R. M. EVANS.

April 3d, 1831.

I certify that I was in company with Gen. R. M. Evans, on the day that David Ewing was taken up in Evansville, on suspicion of horse stealing; that we were constantly together, from early in the morning until Ewing left his (Evans') house; that we did endeavor to persuade Ewing to tell where the horse was, and promised to set him at liberty, if he would do so; that Ewing told us where the horse was, and said if Gen. Evans would go with him, he would show him. Gen. Evans was in bad health, and declined going. When Duct. Craig with several young men came in, Ewing denied having told us where the horse was, and gave Evans abusive language. Evans ordered him out of his house, and said if he did not go he would kick him out. Ewing declined going—Evans got up and pushed him by the shoulders to the door, and put his foot against him, and put him out of the house. Evans did not show any disposition to injure him. Evans was not intoxicated, as I am told has been stated. To the best of my recollection, we had not tasted, nor even seen spirits or liquors that day. Evans was in bad health. We had no further intention than to induce Ewing to tell where the horse was,