

FOR THE PALLADIUM.

To Mechanics, Farmers, and all other laboring men of Indiana.

The same motive which induced me on a former occasion to present the blunt unpolished effusions of my pen, to your consideration, fellow-citizens, prompts me again to appear before you. And here let me declare, that it is not my desire by any observation I have made, or shall make, to create a feeling in your bosoms unworthy of you as orderly, discreet citizens, firm friends and supporters of the government and its laws. While the present powers govern, it is our duty as republicans to respect them, and in their own language, "judge them by their actions;" leaving out of view, for the time being, our hatred of the manner in which they came into power—let this only be recollected at the ballot box in November next. Heaven knows with what rancorous fury the parties to this contest persecute each other; far be it from me to lend a helping hand to increase the strife. No, fellow citizens, mine, I hope, shall be a more rational part; one which, while it shall carry with it moderation, will expose the fallacy of certain doctrines, directly, as I believe, at variance with your interests, and subversive of republican principles.

It was my earnest hope that those busy creatures who are always ready to add fuel to the flame, would have let the presidential election pass as an affair on which you had generally made up an opinion, not to be shaken by the cry of "danger," raised on the eve of the election by brawling enthusiasts; but "An Indiana Farmer," as he calls himself, has willed it otherwise. He has stepped forth as the champion of the administration, raised the standard of discord and strife, hoping by the power of his eloquence, the force of his reasoning, to gather to it a few stragglers, who are wavering between two opinions, or rather between no opinion at all. For the good of the country; for the honor of that class of which I am a humble member, I feel constrained to say the number of his recruits will be small indeed, but quite as many as the cause he advocates is entitled to.

You have often heard it asserted, by those who wished the opinion to gain ground, that the present is not a contest for principle, but for men—nothing can be farther from the truth; and I am persuaded that Farmer, before he gets through will be one means (unwillingly I admit) of opening your eyes to a conviction that there is a principle, a vital principle—one for which our fathers fought and bled—involvement in this contest. A contest in which you and every one who values liberty, unadulterated liberty, are deeply interested.

Having thus premised my field of action, I shall proceed to show you that, in my former address, I did not misrepresent facts, but that Farmer, in the last Palladium, has misrepresented me, and published his own condemnation. What say you to the following from his last address?

"It was my sincere desire," says Farmer, "that the short address I made you in the 34th No. of the Palladium, should be the means of eliciting truth from some able pen than mine, and truly regret it should have been followed by another attempt at misrepresentation."

The sentence he passes on his own production, in the above extract, is certainly laughable and well timed. He plainly tells you that he has made misstatements in the 34th No. of the Palladium, for the purpose of eliciting the truth in reply, but was sorry to find that it had no other effect than to bring "another" into the field, no better schooled in the science of truth-telling than himself. Farmer will probably charge me with quibbling and putting on his bantling a pair of breeches not at all cut to his liking; though they fit neatly, show the exquisite symmetry of its person, the fine proportion of its limbs—and, in short, a perfect miniature likeness of its progenitor.

Farmer dislikes that you should be told that Andrew Jackson had more of the people's votes at the last election for President than John Q. Adams, by many thousands, and that this being the case, congress acted in the face of justice, right, and principle to elect the latter. He says these assertions are all false; that the votes set down for Andrew Jackson, in my last, are more than are given in the United States—admit it. But does this error in any way alter the relative result? If General Jackson is given more votes than he ought to have, so is Mr. Adams. I will come to the point with Farmer on this head, in the manner intended, that you may see how far I have misrepresented facts. On an examination of the electoral votes given to Jackson and Adams, it will be seen that Jackson had 99 and Adams only 84. These 99 electors for Jackson represented 125,000 more of the FREE WHITE inhabitants of the United States than Adams' 84 did. This is what I wished to represent to you, as there has been a great noise made about the negro votes, as they are called, given to Jackson at the last election. Here you see, that aside from these votes, he had more

of the white population in his favor than either of the other three candidates; Mr. Crawford with 41, and Mr. Clay with 37 votes, had a greater proportion of slave or negro votes than Jackson with his 99, representing over two millions of free white inhabitants.

Farmer says there is no "law" requiring congress to ratify an election made by the people, and that no such election ever came before congress. I did not say congress was bound by "law" to elect Jackson, he having the highest vote. But I did say, and now repeat it, that congress ought to have acted more on republican principles, and in voting, should not have set up individual opinions in opposition to that of their constituents, whom they were pledged in good faith to fairly represent. But more of this—I like to hear Farmer on the representative system. He goes on the broad administration and kingly doctrine, that congress "can do no wrong," or at least so near it, as to say when the people fail, by reason of the number of candidates, to choose a president, that congress is not bound to pay any regard to their wishes, but elect whom they think best. I never can subscribe to such doctrine; and I have more confidence in the unbending republicanism of you, fellow-citizens, than to believe that you will. But sanction this pernicious doctrine and it is easy to foresee the consequences: the people will always be defeated in the choice of president, as the constitution now stands, whenever more than two candidates run at the same time; and there is reason to fear that there will always be enough designing and ambitious men found in our country to produce such an event, that they themselves may be mounted on the ladder of political perdition. Sanction this doctrine, and candidates instead of looking to the pure fountain of power—the people—for appointment, will set their engines to work upon congress, where the sphere of operation being limited, will give greater promise of success than upon the people, whom it would be impossible to corrupt by bribes and promises.

Farmer says Mr. Adams was not elected contrary to justice or a long established principle, "but in conformity to them all." I should like to know when and where the principle was established that congress have a right to elect a minority candidate, on just and republican principles. The election of Mr. Jefferson in 1801, cannot be referred to to prove any such principle, though an attempt of the kind was made. That election, however, ought to serve as a warning example to the people, never to trust the election of president to congress, if possible to avoid it, lest the power thus delegated be abused. In 1800 the constitution specifying no distinction in voting, between President and Vice-President, the votes stood thus:

For President.	VOTES.	For Vice-President.	VOTES.
T. Jefferson	73	Aaron Burr	73
John Adams	64	T. Pinckney	63

Jefferson and Burr having an equal number of votes—John Adams being out of the question—congress proceeded to ballot for president, and actually balloted 36 times before a choice was made. Burr, notwithstanding he never received from the people a single vote except for vice-president, through the intrigue of his friends and the hatred of the Federal and Adams interest to Jefferson, came within one vote of being elected President. Here you have a sample of a congressional election carried on agreeably to the principle advocated by Farmer. It is from that he argues that congress, having some times the power, are at full liberty to use it as they think proper. It can hardly be imagined that those who voted for Burr did so through any other motive than to oppose Mr. Jefferson, who had before the people beaten Mr. John Adams, the then president. The constitution was afterwards so amended as to designate the person voted for as president and vice-president, and the votes for those officers have since been thus:

For President.	For Vice-President.
1804.	
Jefferson 162	G. Clinton 152
C. C. Pinckney 14	Rufus King 14
1808.	
Madison 122	G. Clinton 113
C. C. Pinckney 47	Rufus King 47
1812.	
Madison 128	E. Gerry 128
D. W. Clinton 89	Ingersoll 57
1816.	
Monroe 138	Tompkins 113
Rufus King 38	
1820.	
Monroe 231	Tompkins 231
1824.	
Jackson 99	Calhoun 132
Adams 84	Sandford 30
Crawford 41	Macon 24
Clay 37	

From this statement it will be seen, that the last election is the first and only one in which congress elected from the minority, and I pray heaven it may be the last. I say nothing about bargain and intrigue in that election—it is possible that such things had their influence upon the result. My object is to advance

upon certain and safe grounds, and to state nothing I am unable to prove to a demonstration.

I have already stated to you that Jackson had a larger amount of the people's suffrages than Mr. Adams; now I will endeavor to show you that congress did not act justly and fairly by rejecting Gen. Jackson and appointing Mr. Adams. Jackson came into congress with 99 electoral votes, and was the first choice of eleven states, to wit: New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, Tennessee, Louisiana, Illinois, Mississippi, Alabama and Indiana. He was also the second choice of Georgia, Ohio, Missouri and Kentucky, which, added, make fifteen—as may easily be seen by the vote he got in those states. In Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Indiana, Illinois and Missouri, nine western states, he had 63,000 of the people's votes and Adams only 21,000; yet the representatives of only 4 of these states voted for General Jackson in congress, to wit: Indiana, Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee; those from the other five voted for Mr. Adams, in direct opposition to the will of those they pretended to represent. It is very easy to see from this statement that although Mr. Adams was constitutionally elected, it was in violation of the spirit of that sacred instrument, and for this reason, if none other, ought to be opposed. His re-election I would look upon as dangerous to the country, not because of the man, but because of the principle it would virtually sanction.

It must astonish every reflecting mind to see how some men argue in the face of reason and common sense. Farmer would, if his persuasive powers were equal to its accomplishment, make one believe that the people having failed to elect a President, as the constitution prescribes, the election goes into congress unencumbered, or as if the people had never expressed themselves on the subject. If this be good doctrine, why has the constitution required that the choice shall be made from the three having the highest vote before the people? Why not leave congress at liberty to choose whom they please? The reason is obvious, and must at once silence those who contend that the people's voice should have no influence in that body. Let me examine Farmer a little more. At the last presidential election Jackson got the vote of the people of Indiana, and when the election came before congress, her representatives voted unanimously for him, notwithstanding he was not then individually the choice of them all—some of them preferred Mr. Adams. How would Farmer have voted had he been a member on this occasion, and been called to give his vote? would he have dared to disobey his constituents by voting for Mr. Adams? I think not. Then why any longer argue that the people's voice ought not to be heard in an election by congress? The constitution never contemplated, by transferring the election to congress, to take the power out of the hands of the people; their supremacy is tacitly acknowledged in every line of that sacred charter. It was found inconvenient to gather the people together a second time, and therefore the power was given to congress to choose for them; taking care in this selection to combine the popular will. I feel persuaded that it is unnecessary for me to say much on this subject, in order to convince you that a choice of president by congress ought not to be conducted on the principles of a primary election, but on the broad and plain bases laid down by the people through the ballot boxes.

Now if I am correct in this position, and none I think will dare to dispute it, openly, how stands it with regard to those states, the people of which voted for Jackson and the representatives for Adams? In Kentucky Jackson had more than 6000 votes and Adams not one. Her representatives however gave the state vote to Mr. Adams. For this the people set their seal of disapprobation upon them, and in due time put in their stead men on whom they could depend. In 1824 the delegation in congress from Kentucky stood 8 for Adams and 4 for Jackson; they now stand 8 for Jackson and 4 for Adams, both Senators are Jacksonians. The people of Missouri and Illinois followed the example of Kentucky and dismissed their representatives for the same offence, and elected men friendly to Jackson and the purity of elections. Had the delegations from Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Illinois and 2 others proved faithful to their constituents, & voted as representatives, Jackson would have been elected on the first ballot by congress. The punishment with which these members were afterwards visited, is worthy of remark, as showing the disapprobation with which their constituents viewed their conduct in voting for Mr. Adams. Their fate, from the nature of the offices they held, was more hasty but not more certain than that which awaits those they raised by their fall. The 4th of March 1829 will close the scene with the remaining actors.

Farmer seems very sensitive about John Adams. I never said or insinuated that he was not fairly elected President.

My reference to him was only intended to keep in remembrance that he once was president, and that under his sanction two or three laws of noted memory were enacted—the Alien and Sedition laws for instance. He also attempts to explain the reason why Messrs. Adams, Clay, Southard, T. B. Porter &c., members of the cabinet, are and have been absent from Washington, travelling through the country. The reasons he offers are any but the true ones. He had better not said any thing about their farms in Kentucky, Massachusetts &c. as the people cannot be gulled in this manner into a belief that Mr. Clay would come all the way to Kentucky, in the warmest season of the year, merely to see his farm, and that too, if report be true, at a time when it was expected that he would soon occupy a lot that might be covered by a 2 by 7 feet slab. The truth of the business is, Mr. Clay visited the west on an electioneering tour, and I doubt not but that he made all he could by the journey. Mr. Adams and Mr. Southard &c. were out on the same business, whatever cloak they may have worn to avoid detection—Farmer's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. These men, who are daily drawing from the public coffers large sums, work or play, are not to be questioned for attending elections where their influence may sway the result. (Would Farmer let his overseer go electioneering one week after another without making a deduction in his wages? I guess not.) But Senators Van Buren and Benton are to be charged enough to make up for all time lost—but not for the cash. Farmer charges them with travelling where they are not known; with establishing printing offices, and several other equally monstrous acts, highly derogatory to their characters, in his views. But the bait won't take. The people can't be diverted in this way. They will still enquire who attends to the affairs of the nation in the absence of these two great functionaries, Adams and Clay, (and that too since the latter part of June last) and whether it is right that they should be paid such exorbitantly high wages as 16 and 70 dollars a day for doing nothing—worse than nothing. This was not the manner old Thomas Jefferson done your business: he staid at home himself, and enjoined an observance of his example upon others. Read the following circular to the heads of departments, written while he was president, and then draw the parallel between him and John Q. Adams.

"CIRCULAR.

"The President of the U. S. has seen with dissatisfaction officers of the General Government taking on various occasions active parts in elections of the public functionaries, whether of the general or of the state governments. Freedom of elections being essential to the mutual independence of governments and of the different branches of the same government so vitally cherished by most of our constitutions, it is deemed improper for officers depending on the Executive of the Union to attempt to control or influence the free exercise of the elective right. This I am instructed therefore to notify to all officers within my department holding their appointments under the authority of the President directly, and to desire them to notify to all subordinate to them. The right of any officer to give his vote at elections as a qualified citizen is not meant to be restrained, nor, however given shall it have any effect to his prejudice; but it is expected that he will not attempt to influence the votes of others, nor take any part in the business of electioneering, that being deemed inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution and his duties to it."

Farmer concludes his address with an extract from the writing of some itching, meddling politician of the South, which he unhesitatingly dubs the production of a Jacksonian; and takes no little pleasure in telling that they are the cause of the excitement in the South. This is another shallow scheme to impose upon you fellow citizens. Farmer knows very well that it is a few brawling, hot-headed men who occasion all the disturbance in the South—some of whom are Adamsites,—and that the great body of the people are opposed to such disorderly conduct. All this Farmer knows, yet he endeavors, by exhibiting to your view a distorted picture, to make you believe the South is rising up in arms and about to destroy the Union.

Farmer and the coalition are welcome to all the advantage they can reap from the Southern excitement, the Morgan or Anti-Masonic excitement, the story of the Six Militia men, the Burr Conspiracy, the Negro story, the Coffin hand-bills, the Blue book, and every other fabrication against Jackson. They will all vanish as thin air before the sun of reason, or as mist from the crystal water at the advance of day. Toss them all into the scale and let Justice weigh them by the following of the many standards that might be adduced to show their want of solidity:

"My friendship for Gen. Jackson," says James Monroe, "and the strong proofs of confidence I have given him while president, forbid my taking any part against him in the ensuing presidential election."

"Gen. Jackson," says Thomas Jefferson, "is a clear headed, strong minded man, and has more of the old Roman in him than any man now living."

Hear the evidences of Mr. Adams and

Mr. Clay, which, in this case, are worth something:—

Mr. Adams says, "Gen. Jackson justly enjoys in an eminent degree the public favor; and of his worth, talents, and services, no one entertaining a higher or more respectful opinion than myself."

"Toward that distinguished captain, (Jackson) who shed so much glory on our country, whose renown constitutes so great a portion of its moral property, I never had, I never can have, any other feelings than those of the most profound respect and the utmost kindness."

HENRY CLAY.

If these proofs do not incline the beam a little in favor of the Tennessee Farmer, I shall begin to think there is something in politics opposed to the principles of gravitation, and directly at variance with Newtonian philosophy.

A MECHANIC.

Awful Calamity.—We have been favored with the following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Hartford, to his friend in this city, dated Sunday morning, Sept. 7, 1828:

"You doubtless know something of our fresher, but the half has not been told. It is now nearly at the highest, though still swelling a little. It is a melancholy spectacle. Probably no calamity so general has occurred since the settlement of the country bordering on this valley. It is sickening to behold our rich meadows, only on Monday last literally groaning with the greatest crop ever known, now covered over as far as the eye can reach, like one great sea. Not a vestige of land can be seen on the Wethersfield road east. The long East bridge, next to East Hartford, on the meadow, was expected to go off. The trussels were raised, and the water is up to the floor. Several live oxen floated by yesterday—one pair yoked. Several are now standing on the highest part of South meadow, their backs just out of water. A red fox and a gray rabbit, probably visitors from Vermont, were caught just east of Morgan's bridge. The timber prepared and laid for guard lock at Enfield Falls went by two days since; all the embankment under water leaving not even a ripple. The water is 24 feet above water mark. It is superfluous to say, that all the crops on the meadows are destroyed, for a hundred or more miles up the country. Farmington Canal is injured in several places, we hear, and the culvert partly gone, but your losses are a flea-bite to ours." The same writer states that the losses and damages cannot be estimated at less than 500,000 dollars.—Herald.

Newspaper Thieves. On Thursday last, William Wood, alias John Scott, was convicted, before Mr. Justice Orne, of taking, without leave, divers and sundry copies of the Boston Statesman. It appeared that he was prompted to this act by strong desire—viz. a desire to learn the current news of the morning, and a very ardent desire to procure a glass of gin bitters, for which beverage Mr. W. has frequently manifested a decided partiality. Mr. Justice Orne, declared that in his opinion, the liberty which Mr. Wood had taken should be mulcted in the sum of five dollars and costs of prosecution. William Wood, alias John Scott, not being able to pay the cost, and thus purchase for himself the freedom of this goodly city, was provided with very uncomfortable quarters, ("My lodging's on cold ground") in that large stone edifice, situate in and upon Leverette street, so called, to which he was very politely conducted by Mr. Constable Reed.—[Boston Statesman.

Africa.—The British vessels on the coast continue to make many captures of slaving vessels, Dutch and Spanish. A tender of the Sybille frigate had had a hard fight with a Spanish vessel, of much superior force, but succeeded in capturing her. A French slaver, to aid in her escape from a French cruiser, threw sixty-five slaves overboard! A Spanish schooner of only sixty tons had 221 slaves stowed away in her hold, 30 speedily died and many of the rest were not expected to live. It is thought a good voyage if not more than twenty out of an hundred are murdered—but sometimes the rascals kill off one-half—or fifty out of an hundred; and this by professing Christians, or persons countenanced in a Christian land.

Apology. A volatile young man was introduced to a gentleman by his father for the gentleman's patronage. The youth's observations not having the solidity of sixty about them; he was objected to. "Aye," said the old man, "the boy, Sir, is like a pot of good beer; though there is a good deal of froth at top, what's underneath is none the worse for it."

Peach trees. It is said that soap suds, heated after a family wash, and poured about the roots of peach trees in September, will destroy the eggs and young worms that are found in the tender bark near the surface of the ground. The eggs are deposited by a blue fly between the middle of July and the middle of September.