

Circular Address,

OF

JAMES CLARK AND RICHARD A. BUCKNER,

TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS OF THE

3d and 8th Congressional Districts of Kentucky.

FELLOW CITIZENS.

TOWARDS the close of the last session of Congress, it was our intention to have addressed you by a circular letter, pointing out and explaining the most important measures which had occupied the attention of that body, since their meeting in December last. It was deferred under a hope that many of them, which had been introduced at an early period, would have been definitively acted upon, long before the termination of the session; so that we might not be compelled to hazard a conjecture as to their probable issue, but be enabled to speak of them as they might actually eventuate. In that however we were in a great degree disappointed. On our return home, we found the State so covered with political pamphlets, newspapers, &c. that we thought it best to defer it until after the election.

It is a subject of regret, that too much of that time, which should have been devoted to the dispassionate consideration of measures, involving the most important interests of the American people, was consumed in fruitless debate, upon propositions (such for instance as that upon the subject of retrenchment) from which no beneficial result could reasonably have been expected; the discussion of which for weeks in succession at great expense, as we then believed and still most confidently believe, was pursued for political effect only.

It is a subject of yet deeper regret, that the violence of party spirit, so ill suited to that calm and sober reflection, which should ever mark the course of the patriotic statesman, mingled itself too much with most of our deliberations. Whilst the unrestrained indulgence of such feelings must be deplored, as producing distraction in council, and consequently an unwise course of legislation, by the adoption of measures which in time to come may serve as dangerous precedents, we may yet console ourselves with the reflection, that its existence, to a certain extent, is inseparable from the very nature of our government. The history of every republick, from those of Greece and Rome to the present day, illustrates the truth of this observation. It is one of the unavoidable results of liberty itself; which is however by far more than balanced by the blessings which liberty confers. Let us not despond because we do not glide along as harmoniously as the disinterested patriot and friends of good order desire. That there are those amongst us, who regardless of their duties as citizens, and apparently spurning the benefits of the wisest and best ordered government that the ingenuity of man has ever devised, seek

their own aggrandizement, reckless of consequences; and even speak of a disunion of the States with a carelessness and apathy, which when the angry excitement of the day shall have subsided must render them objects of universal execration, is too true.

We need not however be alarmed. There is, we hope, too much intelligence and patriotism in the people of the United States, to permit treason to rear its head with impunity. A few discontented Catalines there are, no doubt, in every State (we are sure there are in Kentucky,) who bankrupt in fortune, and still more so in principle and reputation, perceiving that their only hope rests upon the dissemination of falsehood and deception, would rejoice at such an event. Washington, whose name is identified with the liberty of our country, speaking of that union, as the main pillar in the edifice of our real independence, warns us of the approach of such insidious demagogues, and urges the vital importance of its preservation. He said, addressing himself to the people of the United States,

“ You should cherish a cordial, habitual and immoveable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it, as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion, that it can in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the very first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.”

This was the disinterested admonition of one, who having really “filled the measure of his country’s glory,” looked with the fond eye of parental solicitude, to the prosperity and happiness of a people, in whose service he had spent the greater portion of a long and laborious life. If no event in the political history of our country, had then transpired, which pointed out the necessity of such advice; the sentiments engendered in the bitter strife and political warfare which is now waged, which have been either openly avowed, or so plainly insinuated, that none can mistake their tendency, prove that it was neither unmeaning nor superfluous.

At such a crisis it behoves every man who regards the permanency of our republican institutions, as of more value than the success of a party, to divest himself of party prejudices and calmly to listen to the dictates of a sober judgment. It is in times of great political excitement only, that the wily arts and intrigues of the cunning and ambitious are to be dreaded—It is at such a time, more than at any other, that the country stands in need of the exertions of the aged and experienced; the sober and reflecting men of the country, who from their weight of character, can check the rashness and violence of the more giddy and unreflecting: To such men, at such a period, more than to even those who risk their lives in defence of our country, must we stand indebted for the preservation of our liberties. The latter aid in repelling the aggressions of a foreign foe; the former perform a not less meritorious duty, in guarding us against the machinations of internal enemies.

Influenced by these considerations, it has been our constant aim, since we had the honor of serving as the representatives in Congress of our respective districts, to pursue the course which was in our opinions, best calculated to allay sectional prejudices, and to unite by the most indissoluble bonds, the various States of the Union; to regard every section of the country, as equally entitled to the fostering care and protection of

the government: and to render us in every sense of the term a free and independent people.

To effectuate the first of these great desideratums, we have considered the subject of Internal Improvements by the General Government, as worthy of the highest consideration. What can be better calculated to produce those feelings of brotherly affection, that conviction of an unity of interest, which can alone be relied upon, as the sure basis of perpetual union, than a free and uninterrupted intercourse commercial and social, between the people of every part of the United States? What, we may ask, so well calculated to aid in defeating the ambitious schemes of unprincipled men, who may attempt to excite a belief, that the interests of the West are essentially different from those of the North; or of either from those of the South?

We know that there are many who deny the Constitutional right on the part of Congress, to appropriate the money of the nation to such purposes; and we do not forget that there are others, who although they admit the right, urge that under the present Administration it has been perverted to dishonest purposes. It is not our design in this address, to enter into an investigation of the Constitutional question; or to shew how unfounded and ungenerous such charges are.

You have no doubt seen a list of the laws passed at the last session of Congress, and probably have read most of them, as they have been published in many of the publick prints. We shall not therefore attempt to refer to each of them separately. Amongst the most important may properly be ranked, those embracing the subject of Internal Improvements, and a Tariff of duties, on merchandize imported into the United States.

Under the first head were passed the following bills:

1st. A bill making the usual appropriation of \$30,000 for surveys for Internal Improvements.

2d. A bill authorizing a subscription for stock of the Chesapeak and Ohio Canal Company to the amount of a million of dollars. The subscriptions of individuals and corporations are to amount to two millions more.

3d. A bill to authorize the erection of a break-water in the Delaware bay; and several other bills appropriating money or portions of the public lands to other objects of improvement.

Appropriations were also made for fortifications, for the improvement of our harbours and navigable rivers, and for the gradual increase of the Navy.

Bills also passed, affording relief to the purchasers of public lands, which you will recollect the President recommended, in his message to both houses of Congress, at the commencement of the late session.

An attempt was made in the Senate to graduate the price of the publick lands, but failed. If it be proper, to make any alteration in the laws on this subject, the prices should be so regulated, as to afford an opportunity to the poor, to become the owners of at least a small tract of land, upon which to settle, and raise families.

But should not the reduction of price be confined to those, who permanently settle upon the land, and the purchase of each individual in such case limited to a single tract? There are many poor men with families, and many young men without families, who are unable to buy at present prices, who would make useful and deserving members of society; whose attachment to their country would be naturally strength-

ened, by becoming the owners of a portion of its soil. A home and a family are strong incentives to a love of country. The recollection of them nerves the arm of the warrior, and inspires the breast of the patriot.

This subject will no doubt, be again brought before Congress. Whatever vote we may give, relating to it, we can say, that we are decidedly opposed to any measure, calculated to throw it into the hands of speculators, and thereby place it beyond the reach of those, who wish to settle on it. To those, who are able to buy for the purposes of speculation, the price is already sufficiently low.

Nor can we acknowledge the propriety of the proposition which was also made in the Senate, to cede any portion of the publick lands, to the states, in which they are respectively situated. Why should that, which belongs to us all, to the purchase of which, all have contributed, be gratuitously bestowed upon the people of some particular states? Would it not be an act of manifest injustice to the others? Besides, they have been solemnly pledged for the payment of the national debt. They were acquired by the united efforts of the whole nation, at the expense of both our treasure and blood; and under a judicious management, will prove to be a source of great revenue. Since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, nearly thirty-three millions of dollars have been paid, from the national treasury, for the lands purchased from France and Spain, and from the various tribes of Indians. We have acquired about two hundred and sixty millions of acres, of which, not quite twenty millions have been sold.

A bill was reported, but not finally acted upon, and will no doubt be again introduced, proposing to establish a new territorial government, to be called Huron, including the country, which is situated between the Missouri river on the West, and lake Michigan on the East.

Should the bill pass, as it probably will, we shall then have four territorial governments, all of which, in a few years, will doubtless become great and flourishing states. The history of the world does not afford any other example, of such rapid increase of population, of commerce, of wealth and national importance. Commencing with thirteen states we shall, in little over half a century, have more than double that number; with a population of about three millions, we shall in the same period have increased to about five times that number. At that period, destitute of a navy, we now own one, which we are annually increasing, and which, every thing considered, is inferior to none, except that of Great Britain, and according to the number of ships, greatly superior to that.

At the last session, a bill which had been presented, in different shapes, for several preceding sessions, passed, making provision for the officers and soldiers of the revolutionary war, who remained in service to the close of it.

Of all the important subjects, however, which occupied the attention of Congress during the last session, the bill already mentioned, imposing additional duties upon articles of merchandize, imported into the United States, from foreign countries, was considered as the most important, and consumed in its investigation and discussion, the greatest length of time. We need make no remarks upon the general principles, upon which the friends of the tariff of duties vindicate such a system. The propriety of encouraging the industry of our own citizens, in preference to that of other nations; of multiplying their sources of employment and

consequent means of support; of not only encouraging the industry, but promoting the enterprize and skill of our mechanicks; of creating a home market for the surplus produce of our farms, by purchasing from American factories and workshops, rather than from those of England and other parts of Europe, is at this day, too universally acknowledged in Kentucky, to require an argument to support it; even if the limits of an address like this, would permit. Indeed, the point in contest, on this subject, between the two contending parties in this state, seems to be, which is entitled to the credit of having most contributed, to the passage of the bill, at the late session. It has been emphatically styled, "a Jackson tariff;" and to the South, has been falsely ascribed the almost entire credit of its support. A more palpable fraud was never attempted to be palmed upon the credulity of any people. Can there be a more fair and satisfactory mode of ascertaining the devotion of either party to the principles of the system, than the vote which they respectively gave upon the passage of the bill in both houses of Congress? Why has not that vote been exhibited by those who have attempted to impose on the publick, the erroneous impression, that it was a Jackson tariff? The answer is obvious: it would have defeated their fraudulent attempt. The journals will shew, that while a large majority of the friends of the Administration voted for the bill, a large majority of the Jackson party voted against it. Not a single member favorable to the election of General Jackson, from the states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi or Tennessee, voted for the bill on its passage, in either house, except Senator Eaton. Yet it would be unjust, because untrue, to declare that the whole Jackson party voted against it. We do not believe that those of that party, who thus opposed its passage, were influenced by their devotion to the election of General Jackson; nor is there the slightest reason to suppose, that the Administration party are opposed to the principles upon which a tariff of duties is founded; because a majority of the party voted for the bill, imperfect as some of them insisted it was; many of those who voted against it, declaring themselves friendly to the system, and opposing the passage of the bill, on the ground only, of what they considered an unjust and unprofitable imposition of burthens upon the people whom they represented:

Such a subject never has and never can be presented to the Congress of the United States, without producing great excitement, and even among its friends strong collision of opinion. Such, it is well known, was the case when the bill of 1824 was under consideration. The encouragement given to the production of any article of necessity or comfort, is of national importance; because all, to some extent, may share its benefits; but until competition shall have reduced its price, the benefits are more immediately felt by those engaged in the production of such article. The ultimate benefit of the reduction of price, as well as the more important consideration of our being placed in a condition, as to the article, independent of foreign nations, is too often partially overlooked even by its friends; and hence the difficulty of reconciling the conflicting views of those representing, what is by some considered conflicting interests.

To insist that to the good feeling of the South towards the West we are indebted for the passage of the bill, is worse than ridiculous. Do you not all know, that the people of the South, almost to a man, are most decided

ly opposed to such a bill for any purpose except for revenue? Do we not at this very time, behold them labouring under a most lamentable state of excitement, growing out of this very bill, which has led to the very verge of a dissolution of the Union, a patriotic but deluded people? Have you not noticed the inflammatory speeches of some of their most distinguished leaders; the rash and violent resolutions of their conventions, and some of their still more violent toasts, in which they speak of Kentucky Hemp as better suited for cravats for us, than for the Cotton Bagging of the South? We wish that we could in this Address lay before every one of you, the remarks of Mr. McDuffie of South Carolina, one of the leaders of the Jackson party in Congress, delivered at a public dinner given to him and Mr. Martin. A few extracts must suffice—In speaking of the prospects of the South in connexion with the Tariff, he says,

“ A Government formed for her protection determined and resolved to push every matter to her utter ruin and annihilation. Taxed to the amount of \$10,000,000 per annum—her commerce destroyed, her staples depressed to nothing—her citizens in debt and her government regularly and progressively increasing these unbearable evils, to enrich a set of mercenary, desperate politicians, who regularly barter and sell the interest of this country, at every renewal of the Presidential election. It was nothing more nor less than a selling and buying of the Presidency. The people of one portion of the Union were corrupted, bought and sold by the money of another part, with a desperation and depravity never before exhibited in any times. It was insufferable. None but a coward would bear it.”

And again,

“ The commerce of the Western States was but trifling in any other article, than hogs, mules, horses and cattle, which were bought by the Southern States. Yet Kentucky was unanimous in voting for the Tariff— She had done all she could to destroy our commerce and to ruin the market of our staples. *It was high time she too should be made to feel the effects of the low price of our productions. No necessity on earth should induce a Carolinian to buy a hog, horse, mule or cow from that country. We must of necessity raise our own. How can we buy from them, without involving ourselves in utter ruin. It was madness in us any longer to carry on such a disadvantageous commerce—and more especially with a people, desperately bent through the wicked influence of one man, on the ruin and annihilation of the Southern portion of the Union.*”

Who is this *one man* through whose wicked influence, in Mr. McDuffie's opinion, the Tariff bill passed, by which the South is to be ruined? Will any man of common sense say that he meant Andrew Jackson? No, the *one man* alluded to is Henry Clay, the most able and efficient advocate of the AMERICAN SYSTEM, who has ever appeared on the floor of Congress; a man who by his eloquence and power of argument, has contributed more to its popularity, than all those combined, who are now shamefully engaged in persecuting and slandering him. If Mr. McDuffie then may be considered as speaking Southern opinions, the bill should be termed a Clay, not a Jackson—Tariff.

We are not disposed however to ascribe the exclusive credit of aiding in passing the bill to either party. That the main object of a majority of the Jackson party was to defeat it there can be no doubt; but that those, who on the passage of the bill voted for it, did so from the best convictions of their judgments, is not questioned. We disdain to make charges against any man or set of men, without just grounds of proof. We leave the province of malignant slander, to those who seem to delight to breath its tainted atmosphere; who riot in its filth, and hope

to fatten on its spoil. Not only Mr. Clay but his Western friends, have been often denounced as having joined in a league, with Northern men to advance him to the Presidency, even at the sacrifice of Western interests. In such a time as this, when the most pure and exalted patriots of the country, have been subjected to the scurrility and wanton abuse of the unprincipled minions of a most unhallowed ambition; the most humble who have been, in any way connected with the present Administration, need not hope entirely to escape censure. We feel a consciousness of having acted on all occasions from the best convictions of our judgments, and earnestly hope that the measures which we have advocated may redound to the general good.

With a concise view of a few other matters we should have closed this Address, without adverting to the Presidential election, or any thing connected with it, except so far as it might be deemed necessary, in giving a view of the proceedings of the last session of Congress.

We should have pursued that course, under a conviction that the only legitimate object of such an address, is to lay before our constituents the proper information concerning the proceedings of Congress, and as to the condition of the nation. But no option in this matter has been left to us by the friends of General Jackson. The President to whose reelection you know we are favourable, is represented as a deceptive and unprincipled intriguer, a federalist; an aristocrat and monarchist. Various other charges of folly and corruption are made against him and the Administration generally, without in our opinion, the slightest foundation upon which to support them. It is an easy matter to exhibit charges against the best and wisest of men. The most immaculate purity of character, the most disinterested devotion to country, through the greater part of a long and well spent life, form no obstacles to such assaults, however they may serve as antidotes against their influence. Washington was charged, through the malevolence of his enemies, with an improper leaning towards British interests. His Administration too, like that of the present day, was the subject of the most bitter invective and scurrilous abuse. And when towards its close, the representatives in Congress of a grateful people, proposed an address of thanks to him, containing a wish that the example set by him might be the guide of his successors, twelve men only in the American Congress, were found who ventured to vote against it, of which number was Gen. Andrew Jackson.

To even mention without giving any minute account of the services performed by Mr. Adams, in the various important stations which he has filled during a lapse of thirty four or five years, would occupy more room than could be devoted to it in this address; and to answer all the false charges circulated against him and the present Administration would require volumes. A very concise view, however, of his political life, with a few remarks, as to some of the matters for which he and the Administration have been denounced, may not be uninteresting to some of you.

Mr. Adams first made his appearance as a politician and statesman in 1793; being only about 26 years of age, and proved himself to be even then an able writer, by his essays in favour of Gen. Washington's Administration. Before Mr. Jefferson's retirement from the office of Secretary of State, which he held under Washington, he recommended him to the General as a proper person to be introduced into the service of the country. It is said that his writing had attracted the attention of Gen. Washington. Certain it is, that in 1794, when only about twenty-seven years of age, he was nominated by Gen. Washington

and appointed a Minister resident to the Netherlands. He was also appointed by Washington as Minister Eienipotentiary to Portugal. On his way from the Hague to Lisbon, he received a new commission, changing his destination to Berlin—His appointment to Berlin was made by his father, who had previously consulted Gen. Washington on the subject, who in a letter dated February 20th 1797, addressed to Mr. Adams (the elder) relating to that matter said,

I give it as my decided opinion, that Mr. Adams is the most valuable publick character we have abroad; and that there remains no doubt, but he will prove himself to be the ablest of all our diplomatic corps. If he was to be brought into that line or into any other publick walk, I could not, upon the principle, which has regulated my own conduct, disapprove of the caution which is hinted at in your letter. But he is already entered; the publick more and more as he is known, are appreciating his talents and worth; and his country would sustain a loss, if these were to be checked by over delicacy on your part. Signed, GEORGE WASHINGTON."

He remained at Berlin until the spring of 1801, and therefore took no part in the bitter contests of the political parties, which were organized during his Father's Administration. In 1802 he was elected to the Senate of Massachusetts—In 1803 he was elected to the Senate of the United States. Whilst performing the duties of that station he incurred, by the support which he gave to certain measures of Mr. Jefferson's Administration, the displeasure of the legislature of his State, which was composed of a majority of federalists. They elected a man to succeed Mr. Adams, whose political opinions accorded better with their own: and he resigned before the period for which he had been elected had expired.

In June 1809 he was appointed by Mr. Madison as Minister to Russia. By Mr. Madison also, he was placed at the head of the commission of five, who negotiated with Great Britain the treaty which terminated our last war with that nation. He was shortly afterwards engaged with Mr. Clay and Mr. Gallatin in forming a commercial treaty with the same nation. Having been appointed by Mr. Madison as our Minister to London, he remained at that place until the election of Mr. Monroe to the office of President, who appointed him Secretary of State, in which station he remained until his own election in 1825.

About this time Gen. Jackson advised Mr. Monroe in the selection of his Ministry, to avoid party and party feelings; and to select from the federal as well as republican ranks. Mr. Monroe would not follow this advice, because he said, "that the association of any of the federal party in the Administration would wound the feelings of its friends to the injury of the Republican cause." Gen. Jackson in a letter to Mr. Monroe dated March 18th 1817, speaking of his selection of Mr. Adams as Secretary of State, says: "I have no hesitation in saying you have made the best selection to fill the Department of State that could be made. Mr Adams, in the hour of difficulty, will be an able helpmate, and I am convinced, his appointment will afford general satisfaction." Such we believe to have been the opinion of a large majority of the people of the United States.

But since it has become an object of ambition with Gen. Jackson to fill the Presidential Chair, an ambition (of which considering his course through life, and his entire want of qualification, the history of the world does not afford a parallel) he who in 1817, was of all others most properly selected to fill an office, second in importance to the Presidency only, is now represented by him as an arch and unprincipled intriguer.

To the very day of the last Presidential election, we hear of no charge made by the Gen. against Mr. Adams; so far from it, his own witness, Mr. Buchanan, proves that he spoke of him in terms of the highest respect. How and under what circumstances he has since spoken of him and Mr. Clay you all know.

Yet against him who enjoyed the confidence of Washington and of Jefferson to the day of their death; and who still enjoys that of Madison and Monroe, the poisoned arrows of malice and envy are levelled in vain. His enemies may traduce his character; and those who are out, but ambitious of power, may hope to succeed by raising a false clamour about corruption, extravagance, &c. but the people, however, for a moment they may have been bewildered by the wily arts of aspiring demagogues, and the falsehoods which have been scattered in every direction through the country, from the presses of mercenary editors and writers, have marked the course of the present Administration, and have too much intelligence to be thus gulled.

They have witnessed the most extraordinary spectacle of an Administration condemned as utterly corrupt, whilst most of its enemies except in the South, dare not oppose its leading and most important measures, nay of actually approving and urging that they are more devoted friends of them than even the Administration party.

They may chatter about pictures of Indians, and paying Jerry Smith for blacking their shoes and boots, and Jimmy Tennison for their "board," and about the wages of extra Clerks and messengers or bearers of despatches riding in post chaises instead of mail stages, (as the President in his plain style sometimes travels.) But it will not effect the desired object. The tide of public opinion is setting with a bold and resistless current against the "Military Chieftain," "the hero of two wars," who born in 1767, learned his principles of republicanism as he tells us, in the days and from the sages of the revolution. Where he imbibed his notions of charity and justice towards the motives and characters of his competitors, which taught him to suppose that it was quite fair and honourable to exhibit unfounded charges against them, so that they be made by "his own fireside," we are yet to be informed.

Calculations, in no such case, can be made with absolute certainty, but we believe the votes of the States will stand as follows:

<i>For Adams</i>		<i>For Jackson</i>	
Maine	9	South-Carolina	11
New Hampshire	8	Georgia	9
Massachusetts	15	Alabama	5
Rhode-Island	4	Tennessee	11
Connecticut	8	Mississippi	3
Vermont	7	Illinois	2
New-York	26	Missouri	3
New-Jersey	8	New-York	10
Delaware	3		54
Maryland	10		
Ohio	16	<i>Doubtful</i>	
Kentucky	14	Maryland	1
Louisiana	5	Virginia	24
Indiana	5	Pennsylvania	28
	138	North-Carolina	15
		Illinois	1
			—123

Upon the subject of the Presidential election and the vote given by a majority of the representatives from this State, we will only add, that the last election of members to Congress shews the estimate in which our respective constituents hold us, and the late election of Gen. Metcalfe, who also voted for Mr. Adams, proves how unfounded was the charge, so frequently and confidently made, that the voice of Kentucky had been disregarded.

We have already alluded to the resolutions introduced at the last session, upon the subject of a retrenchment of the expenditures of the government. The administration had been charged with a most alarming prodigality, in the

expenditures of the money of the nation. We did not believe, that there was the slightest foundation for such an accusation. We were convinced, as we still are, that it was intended to operate upon the ensuing Presidential election; and that but for that, it would not have been even introduced; or if introduced, would not have consumed one day in debate. As it was presented however, and by a Jackson member, we did not hesitate to vote for it. Satisfied that the publick funds had been honestly and judiciously managed; but willing and anxious, that if in this we had been deceived, the truth might be exposed, and the error corrected, we avoided no examination however severe; nay, we invited the most rigid scrutiny. Its progress through the House of Representatives, was somewhat ludicrous, and must have been quite amusing to all disinterested spectators. A few flourishing speeches having been made in support of them, which might have added to the excitement and suspicions of many of the people upon that subject, a strong disposition was manifested by many of its friends, to abandon it. But this was strenuously resisted. We insisted that having exhibited their bill of indictment against the Administration, the plea of not guilty had been plead, and that they were bound to acknowledge, that the prosecution was groundless, or to substantiate, by proof, the charges exhibited.

The charges as originally made, in the resolutions, were to a great extent abandoned; for amendment after amendment was proposed and most graciously accepted by the mover of the resolutions, until nought of its original form except its head remained; and these since celebrated resolutions, mutilated and disfigured as they were, but for the name, would not have been recognised, even by him.

As amended, after having consumed a considerable portion of our time, and consequently costing the nation an immense sum, they passed. A committee was appointed. The examination was commenced, and a more complete abortion upon any subject, was, in our opinions, never witnessed in that body, than this whole matter proved to be.

If there was corruption and a misapplication of the publick funds, why were not the abuses corrected. We are told that the Administration, the heads of the departments, refused to co-operate. Is that a sufficient excuse? Do they not boast, that they had a triumphant majority; that it was a Jackson Congress? Could they not then adopt any measure they might think proper? Is not the assertion that the co-operation of the heads of departments was necessary to a successful prosecution of the inquiry, virtually an acknowledgment that the whole charge rested upon mere suspicion? That there may some cases that have occurred, under the present Administration, in which money has been uselessly expended, is probable. Such has no doubt been the case under every preceding administration; and such must ever be the case, until those who superintend its disbursement, are not only pure in principle, but infallible in judgment. But that there has been more of it since Mr. Adams's election than at any former period, is what we most conscientiously believe is untrue. Many have been made to believe that the expenditures of Mr. Adams's administration for three years, have exceeded those of Mr. Monroe's during a like period, by seven or eight millions of dollars. This we deny, and shall attempt to shew its utter inaccuracy. Yet if even true, it would of itself, be altogether unsatisfactory, to prove either corruption or prodigality on the part of the President or the Administration. The rational inquiry in such case is, has the money been properly expended? A man may expend \$5000 one year, and double that amount the next, and yet have acted as wisely in the one period as the other.

If this be not correct, then the wisdom and purity of an Administration would be made to depend, not upon the objects to which the funds entrusted to its care might be applied, but upon the smallness of the amount expended. One man may annually make contracts and lay out his \$1000 only, very unwisely and unprofitably, whilst his neighbour may very judiciously and profitably expend treble that amount.

The same Administration too, might, by such a rule, be esteemed wise and frugal this year; and profuse and wasteful the next. Thus under the Administration of General Washington, the expenditure for three years was as follows-

For the year 1793, it was	\$1,718,129
1794,	3,500,384
1795,	4,350,596

An examination of every succeeding Administration will present a similar result, as to the variation of expenditures for different years. Under the Administration of Mr. Jefferson, for three years it was as follows:

For the year 1806, it was	\$6,080,209
1807,	4,934,572
1808,	6,504,323

There was expended during the first year of Mr. Madison's presidency, more by about one million, than in the preceding year.

Was General Washington's Administration more wise and economical in 1793 than in the following year, or in '94 than in '95? The same question may be asked as to that of Mr. Jefferson, and whether the last year of his Administration was managed, as to pecuniary matters, more wisely and economically by one million, than the first of his successor? Mr. Jefferson was never accused of incurring unnecessary expenditure, yet the average amount expended during his Presidency, was nearly double that of General Washington's.

Washington's was \$2,794,221

Jefferson's was \$5,137,598 61

And Mr. Madison's greatly exceeding that of Mr. Jefferson. Yet we are not by this calculation authorised to declare, that the one was more frugal than the other. The expenditure of any one year is almost if not always increased, by the appropriations of preceding years.

Besides, it would be as ridiculous to suppose that the expenses of the present Administration ought not to exceed those of former Administrations, (Mr. Jefferson's for instance,) as that of a family consisting of fourteen or fifteen would not be expected to expend more than one of four or five persons. And even the increase of population forms no just criterion by which to estimate such matters. The objects to which the money is appropriated; the character of the expenditure; the fidelity and judgment with which it is disbursed, are the proper criterions. For instance, in 1802 we had an army of 2,400 men, costing annually \$844,009. We have now one of 6000 men at a cost of 2,050,317 annually.

We had then six frigates, a few sloops and gun boats costing annually \$900,000

We have now 7 ships of the line, 11 frigates, 12 sloops, and many smaller vessels, costing annually \$3,286,649

And which is annually increasing. Our whole system of fortifications and internal improvement, costing millions on millions, is, to a great extent, the offspring of a policy brought into practical operation, since the days of Mr. Jefferson's Presidency, and prior to that of Mr. Adams.

Whether the system be wise or unwise, it is the province of the nation to judge, whose sanction it has received again and again. The amounts appropriated for these and for the various other purposes of the government, must necessarily depend, not upon the discretion of the President, but upon the wisdom of Congress, and should be increased or decreased, as in their wisdom may seem to be proper. Thus whilst under Mr. Monroe's Presidency there was expended on fortifications for the years 1822, 1823, and 1824,

\$1,368,432

There was expended for the same purpose, under that of Mr.

Adams, for a like period, to-wit, for 1825, 1826, and 1827.

\$2,169,648

Subtract

1,368,432

\$801,216

Making \$801,216 expended on fortifications alone, in three years of Mr. Adams's time, more than for a like period under that of Mr. Monroe. The appropriations, however, for 1825, were made before Mr. Adams came into the office of President.

No one insists that this money has been improperly expended. But if so, it was not the fault of the President, but of Congress, who made the appropriations; who have the right of multiplying or extending the objects of publick expenditure; and who would be faithless servants, were they not to do so, whenever in their opinions, the money can be spared, and the publick interests thereby advanced.

To shew how far this remark may be applied to all the money expended in any one year, for the support of government, we submit the following extract from the very able and lucid report of the minority of the committee on the subject of retrenchment, made towards the close of the late session, which will shew how far the expenditures depend upon legislative will, and how far upon executive discretion. In 1826, the total expenditures were \$13,062,316 27, exclusive of the payments on account of publick debt, which in that year, amounted to \$11,041,082 19, of which former sum, more than ten parts out of thirteen, were for the military establishment, which that year cost, including military pensions, \$6,243,236 06, and for the naval establishment which the same year cost \$4,218,902 45.

Speaking of the year 1826, (and other years would give about the same result,) they say, in reference to the expenditures of the Executive branch of the government:

"It has already been observed that this head embraced, for the year 1826, an expenditure of \$489,776 08—being about one-fiftieth part of the aggregate expenditure of the Government. It consists of two parts: first, salaries and compensations established by law, including the salaries of the President, Vice President, Heads of Departments, and the subordinate officers of the Departments, down to the messengers of the offices. The payments thus fixed by law, and which can neither be exceeded nor diminished, amount to more than four hundred thousand dollars. The residue, say for the year 1826, about 80,000 dollars, is for what are termed contingent expenses, the nature of which will require but one word of explanation. There is no uncertainty or contingency, as to the necessity of these expenses for the public service. The Departments must be provided with fuel, stationary, furniture, books, and whatever else is wanted for the business of the Nation. They are uncertain and contingent only as to the amount, and because the respective items cannot be estimated, with perfect precision, in advance. The great bulk of them is, however, absolutely indispensable. A small portion may possibly be liable to some difference of opinion, in the judgment of different men, according to the views they are inclined by temperament or habit to take. It would be a very large allowance to suppose that one-tenth part could be subject to debate or question, even with those whose notions on such points are most rigid. But, for the present purpose, let it be assumed that one-tenth part is debateable. Then the case will stand thus:

Total expenditure in the year 1826, debt included, being	\$24,103,398 07
The expenses of the Executive Department, including the Staff of the Army, are 1-50th, or	489,776 07
The expenses termed contingent are not quite 1-6th part of that sum, or, say	80,000 00
And of these contingencies, it is supposed, for the present, that there may be 1-10th subject to dispute, as before stated	8,000 00

Which latter sum may be considered as furnishing the field of retrenchment.

Then, the expenses of the Executive Department being 1-50th of the whole expenditure, and the contingent expenses 1-6th of the expenses of the Executive Department, they are 1-300th part of the whole; and the debateable part of the contingent expenses being but 1-10th part, it amounts to but 1-10th of 1-300th part, or 1-3000th part of the whole expenditure—that is to say, 1-30th part of one per cent."

How utterly ridiculous then is it to suppose that there can be in that any alarming extravagance. How very uncandid and unfair to induce the people to believe, that millions of their money, under this Administration, have been annually uselessly squandered or corruptly applied.

If expenses have, in any instance, been improperly incurred, or money dishonestly applied, if it be but to the amount of one dollar, let it be proved, and

those who are guilty condemned. We know of no such example. But it is folly and wickedness to excite an unnecessary and idle alarm about profusion, extravagance, corruption and rapid strides towards national bankruptcy, when neither this, or any other nation, was ever in a more prosperous condition than we now are, and when it is clear that the publick funds have been ably and faithfully managed.

The President recommends the observance of a rigid economy. In his late message to both house of Congress, in speaking of the publick debt, he says:

“The deep solicitude felt by our citizens of all classes throughout the Union, for the total discharge of the public debt, will apologise for the earnestness with which I deem it my duty to urge this topic upon the consideration of Congress—of recommending to them again, the observance of the strictest economy, in the application of the public funds.”

If this advice be not pursued, let the representatives of the people answer to their constituents. Let not the blame be cast upon the President.

It has been said that the President's message shews that our expenses, last year, exceeded by \$900,000, the amount of the revenue of that year. That was given by the President as what might be the probable result. But you were not informed at the same time, that in the same message, he says, of that which was estimated as expenditures in that year, and of which this \$900,000 was a part, upwards of six millions had been applied to the discharge of the principal of the public debt, and that on the first day of January of the same year, the balance in the treasury was \$6,358,686 18. Is the application of the revenue to the payment of the public debt a crime? Its entire extinguishment is what we earnestly wish for, and confidently expect to see realised in a few years.

On the first day of January 1816, it was

\$127,334,933 74

On the first day of January 1823, it was only

67,413,377 92

Our Stock in the Bank of the United States is \$7,000,000, which must be deducted. On the first day of July last, \$5,000,000 were paid. \$5,000,000 contracted for the purchase of Florida should also be deducted, which will leave our public debt at this time

\$50,413,377 92

This calculation shews that in twelve years, almost seventy-seven millions of the principal of that debt have been paid. The interest has also been paid; all the expenses of government, and all just claims against it have been met; the pensions to the officers and soldiers of the revolution have been paid, roads constructed and canals dug, fortifications erected, our navigable rivers and harbours improved, our navy greatly increased and our commerce protected. In fine, no interest seems to have been neglected.

We might have mentioned too, when speaking of the payment of the public debt, that in the short space of time since Mr. Adams came into office, upwards of thirty-eight millions of dollars have been applied to that purpose. But for this, his enemies say, he and the Administration are entitled to no credit, because they have only applied the money faithfully to the purposes designated by a law, passed long before he came into office. What credit can be justly due to any public servant, except for the honest and faithful discharge of his duty?

This debt is divided into stock, bearing different rates of interest. The owners of it, having the United States as their debtor, knowing that it is there safely invested, and bringing a reasonable interest, always punctually paid, would not receive the money if it were now tendered, and the government has no right to tender until it becomes due. Unless war occurs, a calamity which from present appearances we have no right to anticipate, we shall be very able to meet each payment as the money becomes due, and have an immense surplus. And yet all this is to be effected without any direct taxes. Not one cent of direct contribution is demanded from any man. The whole amount of the revenue,

usually amounting to twenty odd millions, with the exception of about a million annually received from the sales of public lands, is the proceeds of duties upon merchandize imported from foreign countries, which we buy or not, as it suits our convenience and pleasure.

Is it possible that the American people, enjoying every blessing, secured in every right that man can reasonably wish for, should desire a change of condition?

There never has been a period, since the institution of this government, that its burthens, if they deserve that name, sat more lightly—For although the revenue collected, is of necessity greater than it was twenty or thirty years ago, yet according to the extent of our population, it is about the same. In the year 1796, our revenue amounted to \$7,042,376. The population was then about 4,760,384. That was about \$1 50 per head. In 1827, the revenue from customs amounted to \$20,190,522. Our population is about 12,000,000 or perhaps more, which would make about one dollar and sixty-five or sixty-six cents for each individual. A dollar and fifty cents now, are not worth more than a dollar was then.

We have attempted to shew, that a comparison of the expenditures (for all payments made by the government, whether of debts contracted during the revolution or since, are placed under the head of expenditures) is a most unfair and unsatisfactory mode of determining upon the respective degrees of frugality, of different administrations; because, among other reasons, some of which have been already assigned, by such a comparison the administration under which the greatest amount of public debt had been paid, would be considered as the most profuse.

You have been told, that the expenditures of the last three years of Mr. Monroe's Administration, were less by \$8,685,307 44, than those of Mr. Adams's for a like period.

The following calculation, made by Mr. Storrs, of New-York, and which will be found to be accurate, on the closest scrutiny, will shew how you have been deceived and imposed on, by such statements:

UNDER MR. MONROE.

Balance in the treasury on the 1st of January, 1822,	\$ 1,681,592 24
Total receipts in 1822,	20,232,427 94
Do do in 1823,	20,540,666 26
Do do in 1824,	24,381,212 79
	<hr/>
	\$66,835,892 23
Deduct balance left in the treasury, January 1st, 1825,	1,946,597 13
	<hr/>
	\$ 64,889,302 10
During the years 1822, 23 and 24, there was applied to the payment of principal and interest of the public debt,	\$ 29,941,359 29
	<hr/>
Which deducted, leaves the total expenditures of those three years exclusive of public debt,	\$ 34,941,942 81

UNDER MR. ADAMS.

Balance in the treasury January 1st, 1825,	\$ 1,946,597 13
Total receipts in 1825,	26,840,858 02
Do do in 1826,	25,260,434 21
Do do in 1827,	22,878,528 68
	<hr/>
	\$ 77,026,398 04
Deduct the balance in the treasury January 1st, 1823,	6,269,585 29
	<hr/>
	\$ 70,756,812 75

During the years 1825, 26 and 27, there was applied to the payment of the principal and interest of the public debt,

33,140,095 36

Which deducted leaves the total expenditures of those three years, \$37,616,717 39
Deduct the

34,941,942 81

And we have as the true difference, \$2,674,774 53

But it should be remembered, that the receipts for 1827, include the sum of \$602,480, paid by the British Government, under the slave convention, of which \$387,079 are included in the expenditures of 1827, as paid to the claimants, for whom the amount was received in trust.

We have also shewn, that during the same periods, for fortifications alone, there was paid under Mr. Adams, \$801,216 more than under Mr. Monroe—and the journals will shew, that many of the men who voted for these and other appropriations constituting the difference, are the very men who now complain of extravagance, and would rely on this difference, as testimony in support of such a charge.

This comparison charges to Mr. Adams's administration the whole expenditure of the year 1825, which ought not, in justice, to be done, as the appropriations for that year, had been made before he came into office. And let it not be forgotten that Mr. Calhoun, who is the candidate of the Jackson party for the office of Vice President, was then Secretary of War, and prepared the estimates for the appropriations, concerning the War Department: and the expenses of the military establishment, excluding the payments towards the extinguishment of the public debt, and including military pensions, constitute about, or nearly half of the total expenditures of each year.

Add then to the sum paid in the three years of Mr. Adams's administration, for fortifications, more than was paid for a like period for similar objects under Mr. Monroe, to wit:

\$801,216

The following appropriations, which do not come within the ordinary current expenses of the government, to wit:

1825. Grant to General La Fayette,	\$ 200,000
1825. Stock subscribed to Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Comp.	182,500
1826. Do. do. do.	107,500
1826. Stock subscribed for in Dismal Swamp Canal Company,	150,000
1826. Stock in Louisville and Portland Canal Company,	20,000
1827. Stock in do. do.	30,000

This stock we still own, and it is money judiciously invested, so that it cannot be estimated as an expense upon which to found a charge of extravagance.

In 1825, 1826 and 1827, paid to the states of Virginia, Maryland, City of Baltimore, states of New York, Delaware and Pennsylvania, which was due to them as interest on money expended by them for the use of the U. States in the late war with Great Britain—which did not constitute a part of what is termed the public debt, the sum of

331,124

In 1825, 1826 and 1827, for building ten Sloops of War—the act authorizing this, passed 3d March, 1825, under Mr. Monroe,

829,769

In 1826, purchase of Greek frigate,

233,570.

For buildings destroyed by the enemy during the late war, also under act of 3d March, 1825,

212,529

In 1826 and 1827, for Creek Treaty, and removing the Creeks were of Mississippi. This treaty was negotiated in pursuance of a contract between the general government and Georgia, made under Mr. Jefferson's administration in 1802,

450,600

For the employment of an additional naval force, on the Eastern coast of South America, (see act of 5th of April, 1826) say for two years, about

0,000

\$3,858,808

The amount of this fund, expended in the five last years of Mr. Madison's administration, was \$293,340 03, making an average of 58,668 dollars per year.

The amount of this fund, expended in the eight years of Mr. Monroe's administration, was \$289,319 78, making an average of 36,164 dollars 59 cents.

This calculation accounts for \$3,958,808, which do not fall within the ordinary current expenses of the government. Deduct then from this \$3,688,808 00 the sum of

2,676,774 42

and we have the sum of 1,284,033 58 in favor of Mr. Adams's Administration during the three years, instead of seven or eight millions against it.

The present Administration has been charged with great extravagance, as to the expenses of our foreign intercourse. We cannot present a more full and satisfactory view of this subject, than that given by Mr. Bartlett, a distinguished member from New Hampshire, in a speech delivered in Congress, during last winter, which upon a careful examination, we believe to be correct. In answer to Mr. Rives of Virginia, he said,

"The fallacy or error of the statement (of Mr. R.) is in imputing to Mr. Adams one year of the expenses incurred and provided for, before he came to the office. The appropriation for 1825, was made in February, and with which Mr. Adams had no more to do, than his successor, whoever he may be, now has with the appropriation of this year. The amount of appropriations for foreign intercourse then stands thus

UNDER MR. MONROE.		UNDER MR. ADAMS.	
In 1823, - - -	\$ 82,000	In 1826, - - -	\$ 187,506
In 1824, - - -	189,500	In 1827, - - -	82,000
In 1825, - - -	213,000	In 1828, - - - (Panama)	} 40,000
			} 49,000
	<u>\$484,500</u>		<u>\$457,506</u>

"Leaving the expense of the three last years, \$27,000 less than the three last appropriations of the preceding administration. But let us look still further back: and first, to Washington's administration. The foreign intercourse appropriations were then as follows:

In 1791, - - -	1,733 33	In the time of Mr. John Adams:	
1792, - - -	78,766 67	In 1797, - - -	172,504 23
1793, - - -	89,500 09	1798, - - -	242,711 22
1794, - - -	146,403 51	1799, - - -	199,374 11
1795, - - -	912,635 12	1800, - - -	185,145 33
1796, - - -	109,739 64		
	<u>\$ 1,338,827 27</u>		<u>\$ 799,734 89</u>

"In Mr. Jefferson's time these expenses, exclusive of the expense of the Barbary intercourse, were:

In 1801, - - -	139,851 73	In 1805, - - -	2,665,769 62
1802, - - -	416,253 62	1806, - - -	1,613,922 09
1803, - - -	1,001,968 34	1807, - - -	419,845 61
1804, - - -	1,129,591 62	1808, - - -	214,233 26
			<u>\$ 7,591,435 89</u>

"These tables are authentick, and shew how very far from the fact may be the conjectures and assertions, respecting the increasing extravagance and prodigality to the government.

"Again: That item of the expense of foreign intercourse, embraced under the title of contingent expenses, has been adverted to, as a source of great abuse. Here, for answer, let us resort to official documents. There was expended of this fund:

UNDER MR. MONROE.		UNDER MR. ADAMS.	
In 1823, - - -	30,584 37	In 1826, - - -	18,627 07
1824, - - -	20,145 78	1827, - - -	36,248 63
1825, - - -	25,474 95	1828, (no approp. asked.)	
	<u>\$ 76,205 05</u>		<u>\$ 54,875 70</u>

"This, which is designated as the contingent fund, till after the close of Jefferson's term, was not distinguished, but embraced in a general sum for foreign intercourse.

"The amount of this fund, expended in the two years past of Mr. Adams' administration, while no appropriation is asked for the present year, was \$54,875 70, making an average of \$27,437 85 for the two years; a sum less annually than was expended by Mr. Madison, by 31,230 dollars 15 cents—less annually than was expended by Mr. Monroe by 8,726 dollars 74 cents.

"Another view of this subject presents results equally triumphant in favor of this Administration, as does every view founded upon facts, and not conjecture and supposition.

"Take the appropriations of 1823, 24 and 25, including all ministers, charges, agents of claims, secretaries, contingent expenses, intercourse with Barbary Powers, and relief of sick and distressed seamen, and the sums are :

UNDER MR. MONROE.			UNDER MR. ADAMS.		
For 1823,	-	198,455 17	For 1826,	-	266,500
1824,	-	263,500 00	1827,	-	230,000
1825,	-	282,000 30	1828, deducting unex- } pended balance }		62,000
		<u>\$743,955 17</u>			<u>\$ 548,500</u>

"Which is less, by 195,455 dollars 17 cents, than the same items of the three preceding years. I prefer such facts to any comment, and I present such facts, as seem to me, to need no comment."

You have been told, that Mr. Adams has received from the treasury enormous sums of money. Has he on any occasion, received more than he was allowed by the officers of the law authorised to make the allowance? No man of common sense and candor, will pretend to make such a statement. And if even he had, whose fault was it? He had nothing to do with the settlement of his accounts. As Secretary of State, he had no more to do with it, than you have. The accounts were allowed by Mr. Monroe, upon the most mature consideration of the law. Not a dollar can be drawn from the treasury, until the account be allowed, in pursuance of law, by those who have been legally authorised to make the settlement. Whether the compensation allowed to ministers for their services, and the sums allowed to cover their expenses, be too high or too low, is a matter about which we need not say a word. Mr. Adams had nothing to do with it. They were fixed by General Washington, under an authority given by Congress; and have not since been changed. They are less, by one fifth, than they were during the revolutionary war. A minister then received two thousand five hundred pounds sterling, per year, and the government paid all his expenses.

During the present Administration, large sums have been saved to the government, by the permanent reduction, in the grade of two, and a temporary reduction in another of our missions, from that of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, to a Charge d'Affairs.

In speaking of Mr. Adams's accounts on the floor of Congress last winter, Mr. Everett said, (and no one in reply, we believe, contradicted it,) "That for the four years and eight months, commencing in 1812, when the first question of his accounts arises, and ending at his return, he received in all, about \$75,000.—For a like term, Mr. Monroe received \$ 82,000—For one year and eleven Mr. Pinckney received \$ 41,000."

A great portion of the sum received by a minister, is not for services only; it is for outfits, and the practice of allowing full outfits to resident ministers abroad, was first introduced by Mr. Jefferson.

As to the letter of Mr. Adams to Leavit Harris, many of those who use it artfully, present a part of it only, carefully omitting to give the whole, or such parts of it as would shew, that it breathed a most patriotic spirit. What writing cannot be made to condemn its author, by selecting a few words or sentences only?

There are various other charges against Mr. Adams, about matters transpiring long before he came into office; and against the Administration since his election. It is said he voted against annexing Louisiana to the Union, upon the

ground of its unconstitutionality. Mr. Adams was in favor of the acquisition of Louisiana. On the 3d of November, 1803, he voted for the bill appropriating 11,250,000 dollars to carry the convention by which it was acquired, into effect. He made a speech in the Senate, in favor of it, reported in the National Intelligencer of the 3d of November, 1803.

He however entertained, and expressed the opinion, that the treaty could not be constitutionally carried into full execution, until the consent of the people of the United States, as well as of Louisiana, was obtained. That opinion he entertained in common with Mr. Jefferson as a letter written by him, to a Mr. Dunbar proves. It was then a new question whether we could purchase a country, take possession of it, and put its inhabitants under our government, without their consent first formally obtained. By practice it is now settled that we can.

He was Secretary of State under Mr. Monroe, and negotiated the treaty by which we acquired Florida. Did that bespeak hostility to Western interests? He is charged, to be sure, with indiscreetly giving up Texas in that negotiation. By whom was the treaty approved? By Mr. Monroe and the Senate of the U. States, at least as good judges, we should presume, as any of those who urge this and many other such stale and unfounded accusations.

As to the charge of bartering to the British, the navigation of the Mississippi, it is untrue that Mr. Clay ever charged him with corruption concerning it, either directly or indirectly. We cannot explain this matter in the limits of an address like this. Many of you have often heard it satisfactorily answered. A clause securing to the British that right, will be found in the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, in which she acknowledged our independence in 1783. No injury to the United States has ever resulted from it, and when the proposition was made by our ministers, which we conceive was authorised by their instructions from the then President, it was promptly rejected by the British commissioners, considering it as a privilege of no value to them, and that in complying with our demand, as to the fisheries, they would concede to us an important and valuable privilege.

This letter is already longer than it was intended to be when commenced. We must briefly notice a few other charges against the Administration, and close it so far as it relates to that subject.

And first, that of 1000 dollars paid for taking President Adams's likeness. By this many have believed, that 1000 dollars was paid for drawing a likeness of Mr. Adams, to gratify his vanity, or that of his friends. Nothing can be more erroneous. It has been the practice, from the days of Washington to the present time, to have medals distributed among the Indians, who are gratified by such attentions, and from whom we have made many fortunate purchases of land.

These medals always bear the likeness of the President for the time being. The \$1000 was paid for the die with which to impress the medals. Mr. Calhoun, who is now the candidate of the Jackson party for the Vice-Presidency, on the election of Mr. Monroe, was appointed Secretary of War. He had a similar die, prepared by the same artist, for the same price. Why has there been no objection to him on that account? Is that a crime in Mr. Adams or his Administration, which other Presidents, and Mr. Calhoun, could do without censure?

The charge of money paid for taking Indian portraits, is of a similar character. The object in taking them was to conciliate. Look at the returns from the war department, and you will see, that such was the practice, before Mr. Adams came into office. Mr. Barbour, as Secretary of War, only did what had been done before, without objection or censure. They no doubt believed that the U. States received a benefit from it.

The charge as to money improperly paid for printing, is utterly groundless. In General Washington's administration, a law passed, making it the duty of the Secretary of State, to cause the acts of each session to be printed and distributed. He is moreover directed to cause them to be published in newspapers in each state and territory. This necessarily costs a great sum of money; but it is for

the information of the people. The printing for three years for the post-office alone, cost about 14,000 dollars, of which there has been no complaint. Mr. M'Lean is claimed as a Jacksonite.

The charge preferred against this Administration of a loss of the British West India or Colonial Trade, by its negligence, is most unjust. The British refused to treat with us on the subject. They insisted on regulating the trade by reciprocal acts of legislation, so that if in that way we had adjusted the matter, our trade would have been at the mercy of the British Parliament. Even a decree in Council, might have annulled what our government insisted should be the subject matter of solemn treaty. We acted wisely, in refusing to subject our commerce to the caprices and injustice of British cupidity.

The money paid to John H. Pleasants and J. A. King, has also been made the ground of a charge of corruption. As to Pleasants, we give the following extract from the letter of Mr. Clay to the committee on that subject, in which letter Mr. Clay says, that Mr. Pleasants "was whilst at sea, taken so ill, as to be apprehensive of his life." He states further, that Mr. Pleasants procured a Mr. Hinman to bear the despatches, and that they were safely delivered; that he went to England, and brought back with him despatches from our minister there, for which he might legally have been allowed a compensation; but that nothing was paid to him on that account.

"Supposing the affliction of disease did not occasion a forfeiture of all claim for expenses, and all compensation for services, the allowances to him were according to established usage, which has prevailed as far back as any traces of the accounts of bearers of despatches can be discerned in the treasury."

As to the outfit allowed to John A. King, the Secretary's report on that subject, shews, that his appointment was conformable to the construction given to the law on the subject, by every Administration, since its passage, which was as far back as 1810; and that the allowance to him was much lower than had by other Administrations, been allowed in similar cases.

We will notice one other charge only, because we have not room to answer all. It takes only a line to contain a charge, but many to explain it, however false it may be.

It is the amount of money used by this Administration, called secret service money, and the amount paid to Mr. Cook of Illinois, who was sent as an agent by the government, on important business, to the Island of Cuba. The authority, as well as the duty, of the President, to use that fund, when in his opinion it may advance the public interest, originated with the act of Congress, of July 1st 1790. It is declared, that "such accounts of expenditures as he may think it advisable not to specify, shall be settled upon his certificate." When it is so used, it is prudent that secrecy should be observed, because publicity would most certainly often defeat the object. Mr. Madison used a large amount of this fund, more perhaps, than all the other Presidents together. Mr. Adams has been improperly charged with having used of it 12,324 dollars 67 cents. Suppose it were true, would it prove that he had acted improperly? If it was not intended that the money should be used, why was the authority given? Mr. Madison used of the fund termed "secret service money," 50,000 dollars at one time. If he was not accused of corruption, why should Mr. Adams be?

The charge however, as usually exhibited, is incorrect. The letter of the Secretary of State, on that subject, proves that Mr. Adams is justly chargeable with only 1,500 dollars.

Mr. Clay in the letter above referred to says :

"1st. That no part of the sum of 12,324 dollars 67 cents, has been disbursed, in the domestic service of the government.

"2d. That of the 12,324 dollars 67 cents, expended according to the third section of the act of the first of May, 1810, the sum of 1,700 dollars was paid in the year 1825, prior to the commencement of the present Administration.

3d. That the sum of 9,124 dollars 67 cents, was paid for services conceived, projected and ordered, during the last Administration.

"4th. That the present Administration is no otherwise responsible for that disbursement, than in having continued and fixed the amount of compensation for services created and begun during the last Administration.

"5th. That the only part of the sum of 12,324 dollars 67 cents, which has been expended in a service created by the present Administration, is the sum of 1,500 dollars."

You therefore perceive, that the sum of 1,500 dollars, and not 5000 dollars, as has been asserted, was paid to Mr. Cook, for the performance of important services, deeply involving the interests of the United States, and more immediately those of the Western and Southern states.

Those who favor the pretensions of General Jackson, look forward to his Administration as the period for correcting all those supposed abuses and corruptions. Would it not be well therefore, after having thus scrutinized the accounts of Mr. Adams, and the expenditures under the present Administration, to turn our attention to those of General Jackson, and thereby to form some opinion, upon what foundation such hopes rest?

He was appointed a Major General on the 8th of June, 1814, and continued as such until the 31st of May, 1821.

1814.		
Pay from the 8th June to 31st Dec.	- - - - -	1353 33
Subsistence for same time, double rations	- - - - -	1242 00
Forage for seven horses 4 MONTHS	- - - - -	224 00
Pay, rations and clothing, for four servants, 1st Sept. to 31st Dec.	- - - - -	256 84
Transportation of baggage	- - - - -	75 00
		\$3151 17
1815.		
Pay	- - - - -	2400 00
Subsistence, double rations	- - - - -	2190 00
Forage	- - - - -	396 00
Pay, subsistence and clothing servants	- - - - -	620 97
Transportation of baggage from Nashville to Washington	- - - - -	187 50
Payment for room rent and fuel at Washington, 4 Weeks	- - - - -	162 00
For medical assistance to himself and suite at Washington	- - - - -	100 00
		\$6056 46
1816.		
Pay	- - - - -	2400 00
Subsistence	- - - - -	1098 00
Extra rations	- - - - -	1098 00
Forage	- - - - -	536 35
Pay, subsistence, &c. for servants	- - - - -	489 76
Transportation	- - - - -	262 75
Quarters and fuel	- - - - -	200 00
For holding treaty with Chickasaw and Cherokee Indians 72 days	- - - - -	576 00
Expenses for self and Secretary to Chickasaw Council house	- - - - -	113 78
Do. to Turkey Town	- - - - -	41 45
Do. from Turkey Town to Nashville	- - - - -	84 62
		\$6890 62
1817.		
Pay	- - - - -	2400 00
Subsistence	- - - - -	1095 00

Extra rations	-	-	-	-	-	1095 00
Forage	-	-	-	-	-	672 00
Pay, &c. for servants	-	-	-	-	-	620 80
Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	298 00
Quarters	-	-	-	-	-	400 00
Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	45 00
						<hr/>
						\$6685 80
						1818.
Pay	-	-	-	-	-	2400 00
Subsistence	-	-	-	-	-	1095 00
Extra rations	-	-	-	-	-	1095 00
Forage	-	-	-	-	-	616 50
Pay, &c. for servants	-	-	-	-	-	680 80
Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	724 30
Quarters, 6 months and 24 days	-	-	-	-	-	226 67
Office rent	-	-	-	-	-	43 33
Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	44 00
Holding treaty with Cherokees, 36 days	-	-	-	-	-	304 00
						<hr/>
						\$7249 50
						1819.
Pay	-	-	-	-	-	2400 00
Subsistence	-	-	-	-	-	1095 00
Extra rations	-	-	-	-	-	1095 00
Forage	-	-	-	-	-	672 00
Pay, &c. for servants	-	-	-	-	-	680 80
Rent of Quarters	-	-	-	-	-	400 00
Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	162 00
Transportation of baggage	-	-	-	-	-	531 20
Services as Commissioner for treating with Chickasaw Indians 41 days, at 8 dollars per day	-	-	-	-	-	328 00
						<hr/>
						\$7364 00
						1820.
Pay	-	-	-	-	-	2400 00
Subsistence	-	-	-	-	-	1098 00
Extra rations	-	-	-	-	-	1098 00
Forage	-	-	-	-	-	672 00
Pay, &c. for servants	-	-	-	-	-	672 96
Rent of Quarters	-	-	-	-	-	400 00
Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	224 00
Transportation of baggage	-	-	-	-	-	166 40
Holding treaty with Choctaw Indians, travelling expenses for self and suite to Doke's stand	-	-	-	-	-	425 03
Pay as Commissioner, from 14th Sept. to 21st October, 37 days at 8 dollars per day	-	-	-	-	-	296 00
Expenses for Gen. Jackson and suite on their return	-	-	-	-	-	351 00
Pay as Commissioner on return, 21st October to 18th November, 20 days, at 8 dollars per day	-	-	-	-	-	160 00
						<hr/>
						\$8109 67
						1821- 5 MONTHS.
Pay to May 31st	-	-	-	-	-	1000 00
Subsistence	-	-	-	-	-	153 00
Extra rations	-	-	-	-	-	453 00

Forage	280 00
Pay, &c. for servants	279 20
Quarters to April 14	115 54
Fuel the same time	74 67
Three months extra pay and travelling allowance	776 65
Additional subsistence	75 00

\$3507 06

The war terminated in the year 1815. General Jackson then retired to his farm, and there resided. Were we disposed to excite prejudices, about the accounts and sums charged, how easy a matter would it be, to speak of the exorbitance and injustice of many of the above charges? That for instance, of 1,095 for extra rations—680 dollars as pay &c. for servants—400 dollars, for rent of quarters, &c.

On the 1st of June, 1821, his office as Florida Commissioner commenced, for which he received a handsome salary. Yet the above account shews, that he had received pay as Major General, not only to the 31st of May, 1821, but for three months extra pay 776 dollars 65 cents, and for additional subsistence 75 dollars. Had he any right to demand and retain money for his services as Major General, and for three months of that time, to be acting as Florida Commissioner?

The following is his account for his salary and for expenses while Governor of Florida.

W. Harvey for passage of Gen. Jackson and family, from Nashville to Washington, Mississippi,	238 00
Peabody and Chamberlain, for do. in Steam-boat Rapid,	170 00
H. Munro, do. in sloop Herald, from New Orleans to Blakely,	270 00
J. Austin, for transportation of General Jackson's baggage from Blakely to Montpelier,	45 00
Do. for board of Gen. J. his family and suite at Blakely,	275 75
Blue and Shorne, bill of stores,	244 31
Manuel Gon's, subsistence and forage from 16th June, to 11th July, 1821,	200 00
E. A. Blane, forage at Pensacola,	146 42
Incidental expenses,	370 15
E. A. Blane, bill of sundries, say wines, &c. &c. for the use of Gen. Jackson and his family,	1047 39
R. K. Call, bringing horses from Nashville to Blakely,	125 93
Gen. Jackson's salary as Governor of the Floridas from 1st June, 1821, to 1st January 1822.	2921 19

\$6056 14

The incidental expenses, without specification, are 370 dollars 15 cents, and the bill of sundries, say wines, &c. &c. for the use of General Jackson and family, amounted to 1,047 dollars 39 cents.

Another account is as follows : "The United States, to John Austin, Dr.

To expenses of Major General Andrew Jackson, Commissioner for receiving the Floridas, from the 29th of April to the 8th of May, 1821, for boarding him self and family, as per bill rendered,

\$ 277 75"

Thus the United States had to pay, for boarding General Jackson and family, upwards of 27 dollars per day.

These are but a part of the accounts which we might exhibit. We are not disposed however, to urge, that matters of account, and more especially, after they have been settled by the proper officers, should be made to cut any considerable figure in the selection of a President. Were those the only grounds of objection to the election of General Jackson, we should remain well satisfied, however the contest may eventuate. But they are less than an atom, as a component part of a mountain.

His great want of political information, his inexperience, his habits, his whole course through life utterly disqualify him for the discharge of the complicated, arduous and important duties of chief magistrate. His rash conduct and violent temper, form in our minds, insuperable objections to him. Remember his unlawful proclamation of military law on the 14th of December, 1814, to operate, not on the soldiers only, but upon the citizens of the town of Orleans, and the still more wanton continuance of it, after the enemy had departed, even down to the 4th of March; by which, and the manner in which he enforced it, he for the time being, completely destroyed the sovereignty of Louisiana. Is not his own declaration, in which he says, that martial law, "while it existed necessarily suspended all rights and privileges inconsistent with its provision,"—an admission of the fact. He admitted, that for a while he had prostrated the civil power, because he speaks of having "restored it to its usual functions." This was evidently in violation of the constitution, which declares, that the "military shall be in strict subordination to the civil power."

In a part of his conduct while at Orleans, he usurped an authority which even the Congress of the United States could not constitutionally have exercised.

His attempt to trammel the liberty of the press, in his conduct towards the editor of the Louisiana Gazette; his decree of banishment against many of the French; his imprisonment of the District Attorney, and of the District Judge, because he issued a writ of Habeas Corpus, in favor of a man who was by law entitled to it; his imprisonment of another Judge, who attempted to interpose a legal remedy in favor of the other, to procure his release; and his treatment of Mr. Louallier, present him in an attitude before the American people, which proves that the reins of government cannot be safely placed in his hands.

His approval of the sentence under which "the six militia men" were executed, as well as that in the case of John Woods, form the grounds of strong and decisive objections to him.

The case of the first is fully explained in what are termed "the militia documents" which you have seen. These documents have been charged to be spurious, mutilated, forged, &c. So far as they purport to be copies from those published by order of Congress with the report of the Military Committee they are literal transcripts. A comparison of them with those printed by order of Congress will prove the assertion to be correct. The pay and muster rolls are voluminous, and containing mere names, could throw no light on the subject. They would shew, that the men were mustered into service and were paid for six months. But we deny that any person on earth, unless by the order of the President, had any authority to detain them in service longer than three months. The power was placed in the President, and we deny that he could delegate to others the right to do it or not at pleasure. But at all events he never gave any such authority—as the certificate of the Chief Clerk, C. Nourse, proves. We defy the production of any order from the President to that effect. So far from it the Secretary of War on the 3d of January 1814, directed the Governor of Tennessee, in relation to other troops from that State, who at the time the letter was written containing the instructions, might have been compelled to serve six months, that he might consider them as in service for three months only—He says: "The militia may be considered as having been called out under the law of 1795, which limits the service to three months." If these other troops then were to be considered as in service for three months only, how could those who were executed be forced to serve six months?

They have been termed again and again *deserters*—The records shew, that only Jacob Webb was tried by the Court Martial for desertion—The other five were not even charged with desertion as one of the alleged crimes.

In speaking of the pretensions of General Jackson we cannot forget his unjust imputation upon a portion of the Kentucky troops, in which he charges them with having ingloriously fled.

He repeats the same charge as late as April 1817. In his letter to the Milit-

ers of the Reporter, dated Nashville, April 11th, 1817, he says, speaking of the troops on the right bank of the river, in the battle of Orleans, "I will now add that the full view which I had from the parapet of my line of defence, gave me full evidence of the inglorious flight of the troops, on the right bank, before the enemy."

And again, in speaking of the Kentucky troops, in the same letter he says:

"It is impossible to write men into heroes who fly before a weak enemy, without the least manly resistance."

We do not intend to present a catalogue of the objections to Gen. Jackson. With a slight explanation of each it would require a large volume.

We will therefore only add a few remarks as to his alleged connexion with Aaron Burr.

The following is an extract from a letter addressed by Gen. Adair to the public. In speaking of Gen. Jackson he says:

"As to the General's very laconic answer to my former remarks on his 'Spanish dish,' I will only observe that this affair relates only to him and myself alone; and it only shews his willingness to rake from its ashes, an old calumny, of my connexion with Col. Burr. Whatever were the intentions of Col. Burr, I neither organized troops at that time, nor did I superintend the building of boats for him, nor did I write confidential letters recommending him to my friends; nor did I think it necessary, after his failure was universally known, to save myself by turning informer or State-witness."

Doctor Boyd McNairy of Nashville, has lately published two letters, written by Gen. Jackson, the originals of which have been preserved, and are alleged by him, to be in the hand writing of Gen. Jackson. The publication of them was made at Nashville, August 12th, and the letters have not, as far as we have noticed, been denied to be genuine.

Your Fellow Citizens,

**JAMES CLARK,
RICHARD A. BUCKNER.**

Sept. 20, 1828.

*Copy of a letter (referred to above) from General Andrew Jackson, dated
HERMITAGE, Sept. 25, 1806*

Col. Burr is with me, he arrived last night—I would be happy you would call and see the Col. before you return—say the Gen. O. that I shall expect to see him here on to-morrow with you—Would it not be well for us to do something as a mark of attention to the Col. He has always and is still a true and trusty friend to Tennessee—If Gen. Robertson is with you when you receive this Be good enough to say to him, that Col. Burr is in the country—I know the Gen. R. will be happy in joining in any thing—that will tend to show a mark of respect to this WORTHY VISITANT. With due Esteem.
ANDREW JACKSON.

Copy of another letter from the same.

Dear Friend

I send you five hundred dollars. It appears to me I said I would send you \$1000. But when I came to myself I found there were appropriations made that I knew nothing of. This I learnt at the store, and Two Journeys to perform, and expences to be born that my recollection did not serve me with at the moment—Tomorrow when you come up arrangements shall be made, so as to accomodate as far as I can—My dear sir, do not fail to come up tomorrow, at ten o'clock I will meet you at my house; I have to see Gen. Smith in the morning at his house—The Boats I think you said five in number and some Pork you would furnish—these must be done against the 20th of December next but more of this tomorrow—you must set out in a very few days, I will furnish the needful—The cash now sent is in part for the boats—the ballance on delivery—Either in bank bills or a Draft on New Orleans the \$3000 being all the cash that can be furnished, this must be appropriated to the best possible advantage—and to the last shilling will be put in your way if you can furnish the Boats and Pork except so much as will meet the engagements already entered into,—I send you twenty \$20 bills and ten \$10 bills—which I wish safe to hand, and beg you not to fail coming up tomorrow.—I wish to start a messenger on monday next.

Health and respect

ANDREW JACKSON.