

While on this subject, we beg leave to introduce, as proof of the foregoing statement, the following certificate, issued from the Treasury Department of the United States, at Washington, signed by Joseph Nourse, Register of Public Accounts, and certified July 2nd, 1827.

COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE.

"I hereby certify, that on the settlement of the furniture account of the present President of the United States, there is not any charge made by him, nor payment made by the United States for a Billiard Table, cues, balls, or any appurtenances in relation thereto; neither has there been any charge or payment made for back-gammon boards, dice, or any appurtenances in relation thereto; nor for any chess boards, or chess men, or any appurtenances in relation thereto."

JOSEPH NOURSE, Register.

It would however be no more than candid in us to acknowledge, that highly as we prize this trait in the character of our chief magistrate, we should have passed it over in silence, were it not for the fact, that much pains have been taken to impress upon the minds of the religious portion of the community that he was an infidel in principle as well as practice.

It will not be unimportant to notice some objections made by the friends of General Jackson to the re-election of Mr. Adams. The most prominent one appears to be, that General Jackson received ninety-nine electoral votes, and Mr. Adams but eighty-four; and that General Jackson was unfairly ousted of his election, though entitled to it from having the highest electoral vote. Let us examine this doctrine, and see if it be sound in principle or correct in practice. The Constitution has declared that no man shall be considered duly elected by the electoral colleges, unless he shall receive a majority of the votes of all the electors. General Jackson's vote for President fell short of this majority thirty-two votes; he was therefore not duly elected. But if the principle contended for by the friends of General Jackson is to prevail, the person obtaining the plurality of the votes of the electors, whether it be ninety-nine, or only nine, ought to receive the vote in the house of representatives. Suppose this doctrine be correct, then that provision of the Constitution is a nullity, and it is a perfectly useless ceremony to carry the election into the house of representatives. Again, if this doctrine were to prevail, the largest state in the Union, could always elect the President, if there should happen to be a candidate in each state. Under this arrangement, one of the candidates at the last election might have been elected with one vote more than one fourth of the whole number given. Such a doctrine, we think, cannot be seriously contended for, because it would put it in the power of the larger states to trample upon the rights of the small ones, and would lead directly to a dissolution of the Union. But did the individual votes of the ninety-nine electors who voted for General Jackson, represent a larger portion of the *free people* of the U. States? or did his electors receive a greater share of the individual votes, than the eighty-four electors of Mr. Adams? If so, General Jackson's friends might, setting aside the provisions of the Constitution, have some reason to complain. If we put the question upon either of the above grounds, which we say is a much fairer one than that contended for by the friends of Gen. Jackson, it will be discovered that Mr. Adams' 84 electors represented, we believe, nearly a majority of the whole mass of the *free white people* of the United States, and would according to either of these modes, have received nearly a majority of all the individual votes given for the presidency. It is impossible to come at the exact number of individual votes given to the electors of president, as at the last election, Vermont, New York, Delaware, South Carolina, and Louisiana, appointed their electors by their legislatures. But to count the individual votes for electors, so far as they have been returned, and give to each candidate besides, the quota that would belong to him, according to the number of electoral votes which he received in each state where the electors were elected by their legislatures, and it will be found that Mr. Adams had two hundred and sixteen thousand and fifty-three votes, and General Jackson had one hundred and sixty-two thousand and two hundred and forty-two; leaving a fair majority in favor of Mr. Adams, of *fifty-three thousand eight hundred and eleven votes*. The following table shews the standing of the votes in the several states, according to the above position.

State	Adams' Electors	Individual Votes.	Jackson's Electors	Individual Votes.	Free whites rep'd by A's Electors	Free do by J's Electors
Maine	9	10,219	00	00	297,340	
N. Hampshire*	8	9,387	00	00	243,236	
Massachusetts	15	30,687	00	00	516,419	
Rhode Island	4	2,145	00	00	79,413	
Connecticut	8	7,569	00	00	267,181	
Vermont†	7	8,000	00	00	234,846	
New York‡	26	91,500	1	3,500	962,520	37,020
New Jersey	00	9,215	8	10,253	119,795	133,280
Pennsylvania	00	5,405	28	35,893	128,827	748,187
Delaware	1	2,000	0		18,427	
Maryland	3	14,632	7	14,523	109,740	108,922
Virginia	00	3,389	00	2,850	135,560	114,000
N. Carolina	00	6,000	15	14,107	70,500	165,757
S. Carolina	00		11	13,405		237,440
Georgia	00		00	6,455		117,803
Kentucky	00		00			
Tennessee	00	200	11	20,342	3,266	332,252
Ohio	00	12,280	00	18,489	141,220	212,623
Indiana	00	3,095	5	7,343	28,474	67,555
Illinois	1	1,630	2	1,343	22,272	18,636
Missouri	00	280	00	920	3,733	12,266
Mississippi	00	1,680	3	3,254	18,663	37,325
Alabama	00	740	5	3,565	12,580	60,506
Louisiana	2	2,000	3	3,000	29,354	44,029
Totals	84	216,053	99	162,242	5,443,369	2,448,100

* There is no return from this state. It gave for Congress 72,000 votes.

† This state sends five representatives to Congress, and gives each representative about 6,000 votes.

‡ New York has given as high as 216,000 votes for governor, and we have allowed but 95,000 votes to have been given.

|| This state sends one representative to Congress.

By the above table it will be seen that the individual votes of Mr. Adams are much greater in number than General Jackson's, and represent a larger portion of the free whites of the United States than his, by nearly a million, and comes within a little upwards of four hundred thousand, of being a majority of the whole free white population of the Union.—We will not vouch for the entire correctness of the above table, as the returns of the election for president, are in some instances very irregular; there were some unpledged tickets in New England, those we have left stand to Mr. Adams, and to balance them, we have thrown in the last tables the whole of South Carolina, and Tennessee (except two hundred votes) to Gen. Jackson, which will more than make up for the surplus given to Mr. Adams by those unpledged tickets. We think therefore, that however the statements may be varied, it will be found, that the results will be pretty much the same.—We will then submit to a candid public, whether, under this view of the subject the friends of Gen. Jackson have any ground for complaint. The friends of Gen. Jackson ought to recollect too, that they owe it to Mr. Adams' friends in North Carolina that the General got the vote of that state—Mr. Crawford had been nominated in the caucus at Washington, which gave offence to many persons in that state, and they were determined, if possible to prevent his election; the friends of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams both being opposed to a caucus nomination, they agreed to unite their interests for the purpose of keeping Mr. Crawford out, they did so, and gave the electoral vote to Gen. Jackson, or otherwise Mr. Crawford would have got it, for his electors received more individual votes than either Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson. They run what they there called an unpledged (or the people's) ticket, and the persons elected as electors voted for Gen. Jackson, supposing him to be more popular in the state than Mr. Adams, and especially as he was a slave-holder and Mr. Adams not.

It is then clear that Gen. Jackson owes fifteen of his electoral votes to Mr. Adams, which had he lost, he would only have had the same number as Mr. Adams. We think, therefore, it does not well lie in the mouth of Gen. Jackson's friends to complain of Mr. Adams, or his friends, for doing them a favor. A great complaint is made by the friends of Gen. Jackson, because they say Mr. Clay threw his interest, in the House, to Mr. Adams, instead of the General. We beg leave to examine the grounds of this complaint a little, and see if there really be any thing in it: Gen. Jackson got, in the house, the vote of seven states. It is not pretended by his friends that Mr. Clay had any influence over more than four states, to wit: Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri.—Now suppose Mr. Clay had thrown his weight in the scale of Gen. Jackson, with all the influence

they attach to him, he could not have elected him, for with those four states, over which it is said Mr. Clay had all this influence, he could only have given Gen. Jackson eleven states, which would still have left him two behind the majority of the whole number. Then on the first ballot Mr. Adams would have had nine states, and Gen. Jackson eleven. On the future ballottings which state was to come over to the General? It is presumable, and barely so, that North Carolina might have done so, though her representatives in Congress voted for Mr. Crawford, his electors having got the electoral vote; but it is improbable to conceive that Virginia, Georgia, or Delaware would. The people of Delaware were in favor of Mr. Adams, but their representative voted in the house for Mr. Crawford, but if Mr. Crawford had not been in the house, or when it should have been found impossible to elect him, he would have voted for Mr. Adams. From the hostility that existed between Mr. Crawford and the General, originating in the Seminole war, it cannot be supposed that his friends could or would have supported him; indeed it is well known they would not. It is well known Virginia would not, for governor Tyler, of that state tells us, and tells us truly, that before Mr. Adams came out in his inaugural speech in favor of internal improvement and domestic manufactures, that seven-eighths of Virginia would have given him their support in preference to Gen. Jackson. If then, those three states had voted for Adams, the vote would have been equal, and neither elected; so that view the subject as you please, Gen. Jackson could not have been elected with Mr. Clay's influence, supposing him to have all they attach to him. And it is to be recollect too, that Mr. Adams' electors received more individual votes in Illinois than Gen. Jackson's, notwithstanding the General got two electoral votes, and Mr. Adams but one. Illinois would, therefore, without the supposed influence of Mr. Clay, on the second ballot have voted for Mr. Adams, and so have given him the election. We are not disposed to enter into the controversy between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Clay, concerning the conduct of the latter in relation to the last presidential election; we are much more disposed to believe they were both governed by pure motives and did what they conceived to be correct. It is indeed impossible to conceive that two such tried patriots, who have stood by their country in the hour of peril, who have so long, and so faithfully, labored in their different spheres, for the support of its best interests, should, for a moment, be led to harbor in their minds a thought treacherous or corrupt. We would not tear from the wreath that encircles the brow of Gen. Jackson a single laurel, nor yet are we prepared to say, that merely because he fought bravely and victoriously, that that alone should be a passport to the highest *civil* office in the gift of the people, not that it disqualifies him by any means, but it is not of itself a sufficient qualification. Nature seems generally to have allotted to every individual his sphere of action in this world, and where she produces one capacitated for every department of civil life, as was the case with our beloved Washington, she exhibits to mankind a rare spectacle indeed. If, however, all civil honors are to be the reward of military renown alone, let us not pass by the heroes of Bridge-water and the Thames, for they have fought as valiantly as the hero of New Orleans, and deserve as well of their country. They have covered themselves with immortal honors, and were either of them better qualified for chief magistrate than the present incumbent, and an applicant for that post, he should have our most hearty support. Is every thing due to military fame, and nothing to civil? Is he not as much entitled to our gratitude who secured to us an honorable peace, as he who sustained us in a righteous war? Is the hand that guides the plough less honorable than that which holds the sword? Is he less honorable who first taught the citizen to throw the shuttle, than he who first taught the soldier to shoulder his musket? When such distinctions come to be made, farewell freedom, farewell equality, farewell that republican simplicity our fathers taught us to reverence. It cannot be pretended that Gen. Jackson is as well qualified for the presidency as his competitor Mr. Adams.—He has never been conversant with diplomatic concerns, with the various connections and relations of the powers of the earth; his mind has never investigated the intricate mazes of human government, or plunged into the occult labyrinths of political science. His own biographer, who has written his eulogy rather than his life, tells us that he was honest enough to resign his seat on the bench of the supreme court of his own state through incompetency, and through a fear that suitors might suffer loss by his erroneous decisions. The same beautiful writer tells us that when elected to the congress of the United States, that being unacquainted with the wiles and craft of political managers, he resigned his seat to one more competent than himself to do justice to the station.—The studies of Gen. Jackson have differed from those of the politician; he was bred on the *champ de Mars*, amidst the roar of the cannon, the other in the porch of the Lyceum. Nor is it any disparagement to Gen. Jackson to say, that although heaven may have kindled in his eye the flash of war, it has not lighted in his mind the beam of science; that although it has given him an arm to hurl the weapon of death, it has not given him a hand to point the destinies of nations. That when it gave him Cesar's head, it denied him Cato's heart. We cannot consent to dismiss the subject of this address without adverting to the mystery that envelops the General's political sentiments in relation to the most important national concerns. In the west, his friends hold him up as the advocate of the American System, or of Internal Improvements and domestic manufactures; and as a proof of it, they say he voted for the act of congress passed in the year 1824 appropriating thirty thousand dollars for obtaining estimates and surveys of roads and canals, and that he voted for the bill passed that year for the protection of domestic manufactures. It is true he voted for both those bills, but we are credibly informed that he declared when he voted for the thirty thousand dollars, that he did not consider it as involving the principle of a general system of internal improvement, or he would not vote for it. And in relation to the tariff bill of that year, for the protection of the manufactures, it was so modified in the senate, that even the enemies of it declared they were satisfied with it, as it then stood, for it was really no more, said they, than a *judicious revenue bill*, and, which by the by has turned out to be true. But did the friends of Gen. Jackson vote for the bill to protect the manufacture of woollens? they did not, they voted against it and the bill was lost in the senate by their opposition. As evidence that Gen. Jackson himself is opposed to those great interests which are all important to us, do not his friends in the south where he is to obtain his greatest support, oppose them most strenuously? has not the legislature of South Carolina passed resolutions declaring that Congress have no right to make laws for the protection of manufactures, or the promotion of national improvements? has not the legislature of Tennessee itself under the auspices of Gen. Jackson himself, passed similar resolutions? And what is remarkable, all those leading men who have turned round for the General, come out the opposers of those principles. When John C. Calhoun who had ever been friendly to those interests before, became his friend, he came out the advocate of the southern policy, and against these principles. When Dewitt Clinton turned about for the General and fell in with Mr. Van Buren, he gave us the signal by letting us know that Congress had no right to meddle with those subjects, or give any support to them. We say it is something remarkable, that such a mysterious garb is thrown over the General's sentiments upon these great national interests. In the eastern and western country we know, his friends support him because he is the friend of the manufacturing interests, and of a general system for improving the country by roads and canals, and in the South they support him because he denies the right of the government to give any assistance to them whatever. Governor Tyler of Virginia the friend of Gen. Jackson, declared at a public meeting of the citizens of his state, "that before it was known that Mr. Adams was friendly to these interests, seven eighths of the people of his state were in his favor, but now says he, "I have deserted him, and Virginia has deserted him also, she will go for Gen. Jackson." Col. Hamilton a member of congress from S. Carolina, at a public meeting, in substance, asks the southern people, "why would you support John Q. Adams, he is a northern man with northern feelings, and bound to northern interests? Why not support Gen. Jackson he is a southern man with southern feelings" (a slave holder too) "and bound to southern interests" (of course to the slave holding interests) "why shall we wage war against our own friends?" It is right enough for the southern people to support southern men, and slave holders, but it does not follow that we ought to do so. If we are to be governed by the feelings and principles that Col. Hamilton suggests, we ought to discard all idea of supporting any but a western man. This mystery hanging over the opinions of Gen. Jackson ought to induce him to come out distinctly, avow his sentiments upon those points; but instead of doing so, he draws around him more closely, the mysterious garb, and withholds every satisfaction concerning them. He has been called upon from time to time, by friends and opposers, in his own state, and out of it, but without avail. He has answered many trivial communications in relation to other matters, but in those which interest us the most deeply, he wraps himself up in a silence as deep and inexorable as the grave. Gen. Jackson then will not censure our course when we adopt his own principles and conform to his own determinations. In a letter which he wrote to Doct. Dickson, who was a candidate for congress in the year 1801, he says "that through life, he had held it a sacred duty to serve his country and him self, never to give his suffrage to a candidate for a seat (even) in congress, unless he were convinced, that his political sentiments were congenial with those he represented & that he would speak & do the will of his constituents." The above sentiments of the General are such as we most cordially accede to, and such as we think ought to be the ruling principle with every man who belongs to a community of free and enlightened people, and especially in relation to the person who aspires to represent them in the highest office within their gift. If Gen. Jackson then, holds it a sacred duty, not to support any man for an office, who withholds his sentiments, how can he ask, or expect us to violate a duty which he holds so sacred. He in that letter calls upon Doctor Dickson in a solemn manner to give to the world his views upon various subjects, and we now call upon him in the same solemn manner to avow his sentiments upon those great national interests of the country; for we can assure him that we are as tenacious of performing our solemn duties as he can be in performing his, and that we are as determined, as ever he was, to adhere to the principle laid down and sanctioned by himself. It is said by many, that a president has not power to do any very great injury to the people. This is a mistaken idea he can withhold his sanction to a bill, and it falls, unless two thirds of both houses agree afterwards to pass it. As in the case of the Cumberland road, both houses of congress passed an act for its preservation, James Monroe who was then president, being opposed to the establishment of a system of internal improvement by congress, refused to sign or sanction the bill, two thirds of both houses could not be got to support it, and it fell. The road could at that time have been put in repair without expending a cent of the national funds, but would now cost perhaps five hundred thousand dollars to put it in the same repair; besides which, the want of such a law, since has cost the Government thousands, and the western country, millions of dollars. Hence it is not difficult to see what mischief a president can do. Mr. Monroe however was very honest in the opinions he entertained upon the subject, and so is Gen. Jackson; but those opinions, in a president of the United States, are fatal to our best interests. A few words more and we are done.

As another evidence of what we have to fear from Gen. Jackson and his friends:—There is now in both houses of Congress a majority of Jackson men. They will now have an opportunity of doing what they have long promised, as soon as they acquired the ascendancy; that is, of breaking up what some of the zealous editors favorable to the General, have been pleased to call "the nest of corruption at Washington," for they now hold the reins of government in their own hands; and as an earnest of what they will do when opportunity shall serve, they have elected for speaker, Col. Stevenson of Virginia, who is now, and always has been one of the most violent opposers of the general system of internal improvement, and of the protection of manufactures by Congress. His speeches and his votes in Congress speak for themselves. And they have elected him too, over an old, long tried, and faithful friend of those interests, besides being a man much better qualified than he. When the bill for the protection of domestic manufactures was before Congress, in 1814, it was once or twice saved by the casting vote of the speaker: should such a case now occur, the present one will vote against it, and it will be lost. If there be any thing wrong at the seat of the national government, or if there be such a nest of corruption there, as the Telegraph, a paper published in Washington, by Duff Green, and some others of the papers pretending to be friendly to General Jackson, have most positively averred, we call upon the representatives of the people, most solemnly, to "break them up," exterminate them. If however, such shall not be found there, we call upon the honest friends of Gen. Jackson, to visit upon the heads of those editors, the reward due to their hypocrisy to him, and as the vile calumniators of the honest functionaries of the government, and abusers of the public confidence, and disturbers of their repose.

The Father of our country set the example of continuing the term of the Presidency for eight years, and there is much wisdom and sound policy in the proposition. Let the precedent be followed in all cases, unless the president shall abuse his trust, and we avoid a thousand evils, and secure peace at home for at least eight years. If we discard the chief magistrate at the expiration of every term of four years, we forever keep up this hideous political strife, decrying and abusing the rulers of our country, assailing the characters of our ablest and most illustrious statesmen, whose names under other circumstances, we could not bear to hear treated with irreverence. It not only keeps the elements of political strife in perpetual motion, setting father against son, and neighbor against neighbor, but it shows to surrounding nations our divisions, and enables them to take advantage of them. Neither is this all the evil; for while we are thus harassing ourselves, degrading our institutions, breaking down the barriers between merit and demerit, tarnishing our country's honor, blasting the reputation of the great and good, dashing the crown of vir-