

Indiana Palladium.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IS NATURE'S PLAN—AND FOLLOWING NATURE IS THE MARCH OF MAN.—BARLOW.

Volume IV.]

LAWRENCEBURGH, INDIANA; SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1828.

[Number 4.]

MR. CLAY'S ADDRESS. CONTINUED.

In the published circular which, in March 1825, I addressed to my Constituents, I remarked "at that early period" (early in November 1824) "I stated to Dr. Drake, one of the professors in the medical school of Transylvania University, and to John J. Crittenden, Esq. of Frankfort, my determination to support Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson." I did not, at that time, recollect, nor do I probably now, all the occasions on which I expressed, in conversation, my opinion of the unfitness of General Jackson for the Presidency, and my preference of either of the other candidates. I remembered distinctly the conversation I had held with Dr. Drake and John J. Crittenden, Esq. and therefore referred to them. In several instances, similar conversations have been since brought to my recollection by gentlemen with whom, or in whose presence they occurred; and it is, from a voluntary and friendly communication of the purport of them, that I am now enabled to lay before the public a considerable portion of the mass of testimony, (including that of Dr. Drake) on that particular topic which is now presented. (See Appendix B.)

This testimony establishes that, on various occasions and times, beginning in Kentucky as early as about the 1st October 1824, and continued in the City of Washington, down to the period when my determination to vote for Mr. Adams was generally known in this city, I uniformly expressed my conviction of Gen. Jackson's want of qualification, and my fixed resolution not to vote for him, if I were called upon to give a vote. These sentiments, long cherished, were deliberately expressed, to gentlemen of the highest respectability, most of them my personal and particular friends, in all of whose estimation I must have stood dishonored, if I had voted for General Jackson contrary to my declared purpose. This purpose was avowed immediately preceding my departure from Kentucky to attend Congress, and immediately on my arrival here after the termination of the journey. David Trimble, Esq., states that, about the first October 1824, he held a conversation with me at Frankfort, in Kentucky, on the subject and prospects of the pending election, which he details minutely, and that in the course of it I said "that I could not consistently with my principles vote for General Jackson, under any possible circumstances." I urged to him all the objections which weighed on my mind, and which have been so often stated, and especially that which is founded upon Gen. Jackson's possession of military pretension only. And, in reference to an objection which Mr. Trimble understood me as entertaining against Mr. Adams, growing out of the negotiations at Ghent, Mr. Trimble states that I remarked, that it had been "greatly magnified by the friends of his competitors" for electioneering purposes; "that it ought to have no influence in the vote which he might be called upon to give; that, if he was weak enough to allow his personal feelings to influence his public conduct there would be no change in his mind on that account, because he was then on much worse terms with Gen. Jackson about the Seminole war, than he could ever be with Mr. Adams about the treaty of Ghent; that in the selection of a chief magistrate for the union he would endeavor to disregard all private feelings, and look entirely to the interests of the country and the safety of its institutions."

It appears from the letter of Mr. Robert Trimble, (one of the associate justices of the supreme court of the United States), which accompanies that of Mr. D. Trimble, that the latter had avowed to the former, as early as February or March 1824, his preference of Mr. Adams to either of the three candidates who were actually returned to the house of representatives.

Col. Davidson, (the treasurer of the state of Kentucky, and a man of unblemished honor and unquestionable veracity), states that during a visit which I made to Frankfort in the fall of 1824, and he thinks only a few days prior to my departure from Kentucky, to attend congress, (it must therefore have been early in November, as I left home before or about the tenth of that month), he had a conversation with me about the then pending presidential election, in the course of which he remarked, that I would have some difficulty to encounter in making a selection amongst the candidates if I should be excluded from the house. To which I replied: "I suppose

not much; in that event I will endeavor to do my duty faithfully." He adds that I stated in the course of the conversation: "I cannot conceive of any event that can possibly happen which could induce me to support the election of Gen. Jackson to the presidency. For if I had no other objection, his want of the necessary qualification would be sufficient." These remarks made a strong and lasting impression on Col. Davidson's mind, and when the resolutions were before the legislature, requesting the delegation to vote for Gen. Jackson Col. Davidson informed several of his friends of the conversation with me, and that he was convinced I would not support Gen. Jackson. He communicated the substance of this conversation to George Robison esq. the speaker of the house of representatives of Kentucky, who concurred with him, that I could not consistently, under any circumstances vote for Gen. Jackson. When the same resolutions were before the senate, (of which Col. Davidson was then a member), he rose in his place and opposed them, and among the views which he presented to that body, he stated that all the resolutions which they could pass during the whole session would not induce me to abandon what I conceived to be my duty, and that he knew I could not concur with the majority of the legislature on that subject.

John J. Crittenden, esq. (who is referred to in the circular to my constituents, but whose statement has never before been exhibited to the public) testifies: that, "some time in the fall of 1824 conversing upon the subject of the then pending presidential election, and speaking in reference to your exclusion from the contest, and to your being called upon to decide and vote between the other candidates who might be returned to the house of representatives, you declared that you could not, or that it was impossible for you to vote for Gen. Jackson in any event." My impression is that this conversation took place at Capt. Weisiger's tavern in this town [Frankfort, Ky.] not very long before you went on to congress in the fall preceding the last presidential election; and that the declaration made by you as above stated, was elicited by some intimation that fell from me of my preference for Gen. Jackson over all the other candidates except yourself."

So unalterably fixed was my resolution prior to my departure from Kentucky, I have no doubt that in my promiscuous and unreserved intercourse among my acquaintances, in that state, others not recollected by me could bear testimony to the undeviating and settled determination of my mind. It will be now seen that after and immediately on my arrival at the city of Washington, I adhered to this purpose, and persevered in it until it was executed by the actual deposit of my vote in the ballot box.

In a day or two after I reached the city and on several other occasions I had long and unreserved conversations with Mr. Johnston, senator from Louisiana, to an account of which, as given in his letter in the appendix, I invite particular attention. The first was on the Saturday or Sunday before the commencement of congress in 1824, and after I had seen Mr. Crawford. I stated to Mr. Johnston that notwithstanding all I had heard, I had no idea of his actual condition and that it was out of the question to think of making him president. We conversed fully on the respective pretensions of Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson, and, after drawing a parallel between them, I concluded by expressing a preference for Mr. Adams, which "turned principally on his talents and experience in civil affairs." After the return of the votes of Louisiana, and after the resolutions of the general assembly of Kentucky were received, Mr. Johnston states my adherence to that preference. He concludes by observing "that no fact ever came to my knowledge that could in the slightest degree justify the charge which has been exhibited. On the contrary, I know that your opinion did not undergo any change from the time I first saw you on your return to Washington," that is, prior to the meeting of congress. During the present summer, two gentlemen in the state of Mississippi, voluntarily told Mr. Johnston that they heard me express a decided preference of Mr. Adams, at Lexington, before I left home for Washington.

Although not immediately connected with the main object of this address, I think it proper to refer to a part of Mr. Johnston's letter assuaging two several statements made by me on former occasions. I stated, in my address to my constituents that, if I had received the vote of Louisiana and been one of the three candidates returned, I had resolved, at a time when there was every probability of my receiving it, that I would not allow my name in consequence of the small number of votes by which it would be carried into the house, if I were returned to constitute an obstacle to an election. Mr. Johnston says: "You replied that you would not permit the country to be disturbed a day on your account, that you would not allow your name to interfere with the prompt decision of the question." I stated at Noble's Inn near Lexington, last summer, that I had requested a senator when my nomination as secretary of state was acted upon to move a committee of inquiry, which should appear to him necessary. Mr. Johnston says: "After your nomination was confirmed, you informed me that you had requested Gen. Harrison to move for a committee in the senate, if anything occurred to make it necessary. I replied that I did not think any thing had occurred to require a committee on your part."

Mr. Bouigny, the other senator from Louisiana, between whom and myself a friendly intimacy has existed throughout our acquaintance, makes a statement, which is worthy of peculiar notice. He bore to me the first authentic information which I received of the vote of Louisiana and consequently of my exclusion from the house. And yet, in our first interview, in answer to an inquiry which he made, I told him, without hesitation, "that I should vote for Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson."

With the present secretary of war I had a conversation in the early part of the session of 1824-5, on returning from a dinner, at the Columbia college, at which we both were, in company with Gen. Lafayette and others. The day of the dinner was the 15th of December, which may be verified by a resort to the National Intelligencer. In the course of that conversation, Mr. Barbour states that he expressed himself, in the event of the contest being narrowed down to Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson, in favor of Mr. Adams, and Mr. Clay expressed a coincidence of opinion. It will be recollected that Gen. Lafayette was in Washington during the greater part of the session of the presidential election. He mentioned the subject to me with his characteristic delicacy. Without seeking to influence my vote, or manifesting the least disposition to interfere in the election, he made a simple inquiry of me, which I am quite sure was prompted by the deep interest which he felt in every thing that concerns the welfare of this country. I am happy to be able now to submit the statement of the general of what passed between us on that occasion. He says: "Blessed as I have lately been with the welcome and conscious as it is my happy lot to be of the affection and confidence of all parties and all men in every party within the United States, feelings which I most cordially reciprocate, I ever have thought myself bound to avoid taking any part in local or personal divisions. Indeed, if I thought that in these matters my influence could be of any avail, it should be solely exerted to deprecate, not by far, the free, republican, and full discussion of principles and candidates, but those invidious slanders which although they are happily repelled by the good sense, the candor, and in domestic instances, by the delicacy of the American people, tend to give abroad incorrect and disparaging impressions. Yet, that line of conduct from which I must not deviate except in imminent cases, now out of the question, does not imply a forgetfulness of facts nor a refusal to state them occasionally. My remembrance concurs with your own on this point, that in the latter end of December, either before or after my visit to Annapolis, you being out of the presidential candidature, and after having expressed my abovementioned motives of forbearance, I by way of a confidential exception, allowed myself to put a simple unqualified question, respecting your electioneering guess, and your intended vote. Your answer was that in your opinion, the actual state of health of Mr. Crawford had limited the contest to a choice between Mr. Adams and General Jackson; that a claim founded on military achievements did not meet your preference, and that you had concluded to vote for Mr. Adams. Such has been, if not the literal wording, at least the precise sense of a conversation which it would have been inconsistent for me to carry further and not to keep a secret, while a recollection of it, to assist your memory I should not now deny, not only

to you as my friend, but to any man in a similar situation."

Gen. Lafayette was not able to state, with absolute precision, the date of the conversation between us, nor can I undertake to specify the day, although I retain a perfect recollection of the conversation. It was, he says, "in the latter end of December, either before or after my visit to Annapolis, you being out of the presidential candidature." He left Washington on the 16th for Annapolis, and returned on the 21st. [See National Intelligencer.] If the conversation took place before that excursion, it must have been on or prior to the 16th of December. But he says that I was out of the presidential candidature. Whether I should be returned to the house or not, was not ascertained until the vote of Louisiana was known. Rumors had reached this city of the issue of it, previous to the 20th of the month; but the first certain intelligence of it was brought here by Mr. senator Bouigny on the 20th, according to his recollection. O. Gen. Lafayette's return from Annapolis, the probability is that the subject of the presidential election was a common topic of conversation, as information had then just reached this city from Louisiana. I called to see him immediately after his return, and, as it had been very confidently expected that I would receive the vote of Louisiana, it is quite likely that it was on that occasion that he held the conversation with me. This would fix the day to have been prior to Christmas. But whatever was the actual day, there can be no doubt that it was before the memorable interview between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Buchanan.

Here, then, is an unbroken chain of testimony, commencing early in October 1824, and extending to nearly the end of the year, establishing, beyond all controversy, my fixed and unwavering decision not to vote for Gen. Jackson. This purpose is deliberately manifested at different periods in different places, and to distinguished individuals who would have been the last in society that I should have thought of deceiving. This testimony stands unopposed, and with truth, cannot be opposed by a solitary individual. There does not exist a human being, and if the dead could be recalled, one could not be summoned from the grave, who could truly testify that I ever expressed or ever intimated the remotest intention to vote for Gen. Jackson, in any contingency whatever. As to him, my mind was never for a moment in doubt or difficulty. And whatever personal predilection I might have entertained for Mr. Crawford, of whose state of health there were such opposite representations in the public prints, when I saw him myself, there was no alternative in my judgment but that which I embraced. I have reason to believe that Gen. Jackson and his friends cherished no expectation that I would vote for him. Gen. Call, the then delegate from Florida, was his ardent & intimate friend, and had been his aid. They travelled together on their journey to Washington city in the fall of 1824. In a letter from Gen. Jackson to Mr. Eaton, which is contained in the 66th page of the 23rd vol. of Niles' Register: he states that Gen. Call was with him on that journey, and he refers to him as corroborating his own memory relative to a transaction at Washington, (Pennsylvania). It is presumable that the election with its prospects and hopes must have frequently formed a subject of conversation on the journey. It can scarcely be doubted that Gen. Call was well acquainted with Gen. Jackson's views and expectations. At a tavern at Rockville, in Maryland, about fifteen miles from this city, during that same journey, Gen. Call and several other gentlemen engaged in conversation about the presidential election. John Braddock, esq. (a gentleman not known to me, but who I understand, is a merchant of great respectability), was present; and he states that "when the vote which Mr. Clay would probably give was spoken of, Gen. Call declared that the friends of Gen. Jackson did not expect Mr. Clay to vote for him, and if he did so, it would be an act of duplicity on his part." [See appendix C.]

In Gen. Jackson's address to the public of the 18th of July last, touching his previous statements to Mr. Beverly, and communicating the name of Mr. Buchanan, as the gentleman who bore the imaginary overture, he says, "the origin—the beginning of this matter was at my own house and fireside; where surely a freeman may be permitted to speak on public topics, without having

ascribed to him improper designs." From this statement, the fair inference is that Gen. Jackson intends to aver that he had never before spoken of his charge against me. The "origin—the beginning" of this matter was, he says, at his own fireside; that is, it was in March, 1827, when according to Mr. Beverly, before a crowd of company, of which there were no less than seven Virginians he proclaimed his accusation. The obligation to observe the principles of honor, and to speak with scrupulous veracity of all men, and especially of our competitors, is unaffected by time or place. The domestic fireside has no privilege which exempts a man of honor from the force of that obligation. On the contrary there, more than in any other place, in the midst of one's family, should examples be exhibited of truth, of charity, and of kindness towards our fellow men. All the surrounding circumstances tend to soothe the vindictive passions, and to inculcate moderation.—Whether the privileges of the domestic circle have been abused by Gen. Jackson, or not, in my instance, let the impartial world decide.—The attitude in which he stood before the American people, and the subsisting relations between him and me, one might have supposed would prompt him to the observance of the greatest delicacy. Had he practised it? If indeed, in an unguarded moment of hilarity, amidst his convivial friends, in his own domicile, he had incautiously touched a subject, respecting which he might have been expected to prescribe to himself the most profound silence, he might possibly find, not any justification, but some excuse for his indiscretion, in the public liberality. But what must be the general surprise when the fact turns out to be that the "origin—the beginning" of this matter with Gen. Jackson, was not, as he alleges, in March, 1827, but at least two years before; not, as he alleges, at his own fireside, but in public places, on the highway, at taverns, and on board a steam boat! I have expected to receive testimony to establish the fact of his promulgating his charge on all those various occasions, during his journey on his return from Congress, in March, 1825. At present, I have only obtained it in part. [See Appendix D.]

Mr. Daniel Large testifies "that on my way down the Ohio from Wheeling to Cincinnati, in the month of March, 1825, on board the steam-boat General Neville, among many other passengers were Gen. Jackson and a number of gentlemen from Pennsylvania, some of whom remarked to the General that they regretted that he had not been elected President instead of Mr. Adams. Gen. Jackson replied, that if he would have made the same promises and offers to Mr. Clay, that Mr. Adams had done, he (Gen. Jackson) would then, in that case, have been in the Presidential chair, but he would make no promises to any; that if he went to the presidential chair, he would go with clean hands and uncontrolled by any one."

To this statement, Mr. William Crosswell, who was present, subjoins a certificate that "it is a faithful account of Gen. Jackson's conversation on the occasion alluded to." Both of those gentlemen, I have been informed are respectable citizens of Philadelphia.

I have understood, that to the Reverend Andrew Wyllie, Major Davis, and others in Washington, in Pennsylvania, on one occasion; at a tavern in West Alexandria, in the same county on another; at Brownsville; at Cincinnati; at Louisville; and at Bowling Green, in a tavern, in Kentucky, Gen. Jackson made similar assertions. Should the additional proof expected arrive, it shall be presented to the public. Whether such was the design or not, General Jackson appears to have proclaimed his accusation, at such convenient and separated points, as would insure its general circulation. We have the testimony of Gen. Duff Green, (which is at least admissible on such an occasion) that he personally knew of General Jackson speaking to the same effect as early as March, 1825.

Thus it appears that, in March, 1825, at various places, in the presence of many persons, Gen. Jackson took upon himself to represent that Mr. Adams had made offers to me, and that if he had made similar proposals, he, and not Mr. Adams, would have been elected President. With what truth then can he assert, as he has done, that the "origin" of his charge was two years afterwards at his own fireside? Or that he "has not gone into the highways and market places" to proclaim his opinions? Whilst he has made no protest against