

the national legislature, that that body was to be a complete barrier against the executive encroachment upon the rights of the people, and to stand firm against him, whenever corrupt bargains should be offered within or without our jurisdiction.

The charge existed against Mr. Adams and Clay prior to the 9th of February, 1825, the day the presidential election took place, and after the 2nd day of March following. The nomination of Mr. Clay to be secretary of state was made by Mr. Adams after he was sworn into office, and could not have been made sooner to the senate than the 4th or 5th.

The senate was composed of distinguished men, of great talents. Among them was Messrs. Rowan, Van Buren, Dickerson, and Benton, all of whom voted to confirm the nomination of Mr. Clay, with many others, as well as I recollect. The proof if I be wrong is at hand—secrecy being removed by the senate, or I would not venture to violate the rules of that body.

Gentlemen, as to the direct understanding between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, specified in your second interrogatory, I have only to say, the leading friends of all parties, Adams, Jackson, Crawford, Clay, and Calhoun, were all present, together with witnesses, as far as I have heard—charges, recent, fresh and not stale, as user and accused present also, with two tribunals ready to hear, receive evidence, decide, and give evidence to the American people, of trick, management, bargain and sale of their rights.

The two tribunals, House of Representatives and their committee of seven distinguished members one, the other, the senate of the United States, the complete check upon and against executive corruption, and time in abundance to prove the charge from the 3rd of February, 1825, to the 5 of March same year. No evidence was offered to the senate of any charge against Clay and Adams.

The third interrogatory I answer, as to Mr. Adams, in the negative. It is my duty to state that, in my opinion, the amount paid out of the contingent fund to Thomas L. McKinney, a clerk in the war department, who has to a great extent the control of the fund, is an evidence of profuseness, and want of attention of the then secretary of war, who is an honest man, and should not trust too far. I refer you to page 31, of the report of the Committee on Retrenchment, in the House of Representatives, for the whole matter. It will be recollect that that committee differed. A majority decided one way, and a minority another.

The majority, however, in the page named says, "This principle was resisted by the Second Comptroller, who referred the subject to the president (meaning Mr. Adams) and he decided that the principle contended for by the Second Comptroller, was correct in reference to the case Thos. L. McKinney."

The shortness of the time I have been allowed to answer as you have requested, is the only excuse I have for saying, that if any error on my part may lead to the prejudice of any individual, it shall be my duty to retract it.

Respectfully your obedient servant.

JAMES NOBLE.

To Dennis Pennington, James B. Slaughter, John F. Ross, John H. Thompson, Benjamin Adams.

MADISON, 26th Sept. 1828.

Gentlemen: Your letter enclosing the proceedings of the Corydon meeting of the 15th of the present month, has been received. The proceedings refer to the presidential election of February, 1825; to the charge of corruption, against Messrs. Adams and Clay in relation to the appointment of Secretary of State, and to the charge of waste and prodigality against the President, in the expenditure of his public moneys. The meeting suggests my "presence at the seat of the government; that I must reasonably be presumed to be acquainted with the character and circumstances of that election, and able to inform, whether such charges are, or are not well founded," and hold me "bound to reply to all respectful applications for light and knowledge, from any portion of my constituents." While I cannot but regret the occasion which calls for an exhibit of my opinions on the questions of great political excitement, I do not feel myself at liberty to decline explicit answers to the interrogatories put. The meeting, however, is mistaken in the fact of my presence at the seat of government at the time of that election. I took my seat in the Senate of the U. S., the 4th of March, 1825, arriving at the city the previous day, and have no advantage over any of my fellow citizens, derived from personal observation.

I am asked if I know or believe that there was any direct or indirect understanding between Messrs. Adams and Clay, at or before the last Presidential election, in reference to the office of Secretary of State. I answer in the negative. It is well known that previous to the last Presidential election, I was the friend of Mr. Clay and wished his success, but I voted for the confirmation of his appointment as Secretary of State, with a degree of reluctance, believing that by this course his talents and his

prospects would be thrown into the shade. I well recollect my own surprise, that he should consent to leave the Speaker's chair of the House of Representatives, for the office of Secretary of State, and have reason to believe, that he accepted it with regret, as one less suited to his taste, and less eligible, than the position he had long occupied in the House.

The third interrogatory I answer also in the negative; and it is here proper to remark, that with the specific appropriations, authorized by law, the President has nothing to do more than any other individual. He cannot divert such appropriations from the object designated by law. It is the contingent fund only over which he has control, and for which he is fairly accountable; and without looking for perfection in any, I have been, and still am of opinion, that his vigilance in this branch of the public service, would well compare with that of his predecessors, and has been generally in good proportion to the scrutiny his public conduct has uniformly received.

I remain, gentlemen, with the greatest respect, your friend and fellow-citizens.

WILLIAM HENDRICKS.

Dennis Pennington, James B. Slaughter, John F. Ross, John H. Thompson, Benjamin Adams, Esquires.

ADDRESS OF THE Jackson Committee,

To the People of Indiana, adopted by the Central Committee, at a general meeting held in Salem, on the 18th October.

Fellow Citizens—An "Address of the administration standing committee to their fellow citizens of Indiana," recently issued (but without date,) contains a variety of statements, designed, if not calculated, to deceive those who are not conversant with the political history of the country. The writer of that address sets out with professions as fair as his objects are foul; his ostensible object is, "to aid in diffusing correct information among the body of the people;" and speaking for the whole committee, he remarks: "We shall advance no assertions but what are founded on facts indisputably established."

Of the alleged facts, said by this writer to be "indisputably established," it will hereafter become our business to speak.

Our first duty is, to remind you, fellow citizens, of the paramount, vital, principle, involved in the present struggle between the republican party and the supporters of the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay.

In the election of Mr. Adams, the will of a majority of the American people was disregarded and defied. After he had received a lean minority of the votes of the people, the election devolved on Congress, by which body Mr. Adams was appointed president. This appointment was effected by an unexpected and unnatural coalition between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay and their friends.

Unexpected, because Mr. Clay and his friends were particularly hostile to Mr. Adams, and to cabinet succession; unnatural, because, as you all know, the supporters of Mr. Clay were exceedingly clamorous, previous to the last election, for a western president! it was by this singular coalition, which embraced only a minority of the members of Congress, that

Mr. Adams was elevated to the presidency, in opposition to the sovereign will of a majority of the American people. The motives which actuated the parties could not be misunderstood. Mr. Adams' popularity was supposed to be overwhelming in the north—that of Mr. Clay was considered sufficient to sway the west. These suppositions seemed to authorize the opinion, that, by the union of their strength in opposite sections of the confederacy, followed by an interchange of offices, Messrs. Adams and Clay would, after placing themselves in power, be able to perpetuate that power, by prostituting the patronage of the government to selfish and ambitious purposes. Upon these considerations, Mr. Clay, by his influence and exertions, conferred on Mr. Adams the office of president, and Mr. Adams in turn, immediately conferred on Mr. Clay the office of secretary of state. We thus see that the election was corrupt—that the parties were actuated by selfish and ambitious motives. Mr. Clay has himself acknowledged, in his letter to Mr. Blair of Kentucky, that the western members of Congress were induced to vote for Mr. Adams by their "kind wishes towards him," (Mr. Clay.) In the summer of 1825, three of the members of Congress from Kentucky, who voted with Mr. Clay for Mr. Adams, attempted to justify their conduct, by acknowledging that an understanding did take place between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, that the former would make the latter secretary of state in event of his election.

It has indeed been asserted, that Mr. Adams received a majority of votes over Gen. Jackson, but you will not find this assertion among the "facts indisputably established" in the coalition address to which we have called your attention. The writer of that address knew that the evidence to disprove such a declaration could easily be adduced. He knew

that Gen. Jackson received in the states of Ohio, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Illinois and Missouri 68,067 votes; Adams 21,553; Clay 43,876; Crawford 2,330; that in those eight western states Gen. Jackson's majority over Mr. Adams was 46,512; he knew that in Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode-Island, Virginia, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Maryland Gen. Jackson received 84,884; Adams 83,769; Clay 2,801; Crawford 44,975; that of the free white votes polled in the United States, Gen. Jackson received 152,951; Adams 105,392; Clay 46,668; Crawford 47,205; and that Gen. Jackson's majority of the popular votes, so far as taken throughout the United States over Mr. Adams, was 47,624, and over both Adams and Clay 961.—Of the votes of the electors appointed by the state Legislatures, Mr. Adams obtained 7 in Vermont, 26 in N. York, 1 in Delaware, and 1 in Louisiana—say 36 votes; Gen. Jackson obtained in New York 1, in Louisiana 3, and in South-Carolina 11—say 15. Of the 99 votes received by Gen. Jackson, 84 were elected by the people. Of the 84 votes received by Mr. Adams only 48 were elected by the people. Yet with all these facts before them, eighty seven out of two hundred and thirteen members of congress appointed Mr. Adams president over Gen. Jackson, and the people are now called upon to ratify the usurpation—to declare by their votes, that they are prepared to surrender the vital principle of all free institutions—the natural and undeniable right of the majority to decide who shall be the President, as well as to influence and control the acts of the National Legislature! Can an intelligent people be prepared to surrender a principle thus vitally important? Are we already so far "degenerated from our original free principles" as to be prepared to submit to the rule of a corrupt and ambitious minority?

So long as the public will shall continue to control your elections, the sovereign power will abide with the majority; but whenever a minority, whether by artifice, by dint of patronage or by force, shall be able to retain the command of the general government, the character of that government will be radically changed—the few will rule the many—and the transition from such a state to monarchy will be easy, natural and rapid. It is, therefore, to be decided by the approaching election, whether the people of the U. S. are now willing to perpetuate the authority of a minority president, and to surrender their power and sovereignty into the hands of a minority. This is the real question at issue—this is the vital principle involved in the present momentous struggle.

To draw your attention from these important truths, and from this great first principle of Republican government, is now the leading object of the opponents of the Republican candidate, Andrew Jackson. To divert your attention from the real character of this momentous contest, falsehoods and forgeries, almost innumerable, have been laid before you. Have not the friends of Adams and Clay underrated your intelligence, and presumed too much upon your supposed ignorance and love of scandal? They are evidently acting upon the presumption, that you are ignorant of historical facts which stamp all the charges which have been made against General Jackson, as base and infamous. At the close of the late war, the American Congress voted Gen. Jackson a gold medal and the thanks of the nation, for his patriotic and judicious conduct, and unprecedented victories; the legislature of Pennsylvania, New York, Kentucky, and other States added their solemn and unanimous testimonial to that of Congress. In 1819 General Jackson's conduct again passed the ordeal of congress. A large majority of the Representatives of the American people then declared, that his career had been wise, patriotic and glorious. He was then defended by Mr. Adams, who solemnly asserted, "that his whole career had been signalized by the purest intentions and most elevated purposes." In 1822 Mr. John Q. Adams renewed his declaration in favor of the purity and talents of Gen. Jackson; and as late as the winter of 1824, a splendid party was given by Mr. Adams, at his residence in Washington in honor of the glorious victory of the 8th of January and the General who had achieved it. Even the identical gentleman who wrote the address of the Administration standing committee, John H. Farnham, Esq., made the following declaration in the spring of 1825 in a public and solemn address to General Jackson.

"General—The citizens of Jeffersonville hail you with a cordial welcome to their village, and it is with peculiar satisfaction that I act as the organ of their feelings on this occasion. They are proud of embracing every opportunity to exhibit their admiration and gratitude for the favorite soldier and patriot of America. If the wishes of Indiana have not been realized, her citizens have at least distinctly indicated their preference, and whether crowned with the insignia of

five, or enjoying the sacred retirement of domestic life, the Hero of New Orleans will ever claim and possess their lic affairs "are conducted by men of ex-

warmest affections. Yes General, the recollection of your EMINENT SERVICES and SACRIFICES, IN THE CAUSE OF OUR COUNTRY, SHALL EVER LIVE GREEN IN OUR MEMORIES, and our children's children be taught to lisp the name of Jackson."

Such are the declarations of John H. Farnham, Esq. in the spring of 1825. What crime has General Jackson committed since that period? What misdeed has his envenomed persecutors ventured to allege against him, a having been committed since 1825? None my fellow citizens—No not one. What then has changed Mr. Farnham. We will not say it has been the hope of reward of office. It is his business to account for his own inconsistency, but we hold that Mr. Farnham's unbiased testimony in favour of Andrew Jackson, must at least be conclusive against the four charges which this same Mr. Farnham has recently published in the shape of an address of the Administration standing committee of Indiana, against "the favorite soldier and patriot of America."

In 1825 it gave Mr. Farnham "peculiar satisfaction" to act as the organ of those who were & still are "proud of embracing every opportunity to exhibit their admiration and gratitude for the favorite soldier and patriot of America." It then gave Mr. Farnham "peculiar satisfaction" to exalt General Jackson above Madison, Monroe and Jefferson, as the favorite patriot of America, who was ever to claim and possess our warmest affections, and the recollections of whose eminent services and sacrifices, were ever to live green in Mr. Farnham's memory, and our children's children were to be taught, with "peculiar satisfaction" by this same Farnham to lisp the name of Jackson!" Not content with securing to General Jackson, the "gratitude," "affection," and "admiration" of the voters of Indiana, Mr. Farnham, was in 1825, anxious to teach even the innocent lisp offspring of his fellow citizens to join him in fervently proclaiming the worth, the talents and purity of the favorite patriot of America. Then Gen. Jackson, was unequalled by Madison, Monroe or Jefferson! Now Mr. Farnham assures the people, that Gen. Jackson, is an ignoramus, a tyrant, a murderer, a Burrite, and an enemy to the people of Indiana! Again, we call on this champion of the coalition to point to a single misdeed committed by the "favorite patriot and soldier of America" since he was so pronounced by Mr. Farnham himself. He cannot do it, though he has had the hardihood to assert, that Gen. Jackson's character "has been probed and found tainted to the core."

In what sort of an attitude does Mr. Farnham, the writer of the address of the administration standing committee now stand? His own testimony given at a time, and under circumstances that held out no inducement to him to misrepresent General Jackson, stands recorded, as a triumphant refutation of the foul charges he has dared to make, on the eve of the election, against the "favorite soldier and patriot of America," for the purpose of misleading and deceiving the people. The writer of the administration address stands self-convicted. His calumnies are refuted by his own public declarations. Thus situated, the people cannot otherwise than set him down as an impotent brawler, unworthy of confidence.

The time was when Mr. Clay sung the praise of Jackson—that was before he imagined Gen. Jackson would ever be brought forward for the Presidency, but after all the crimes now imputed to Gen. Jackson and alleged to have been committed. Then Mr. Clay could boast of the national glory acquired by our Jacksons and Deceaturs—then he could defend the character of Gen. Jackson and claim it as the moral property of the nation; but his ambition ever on the alert, soon taught him to fear the "Military chieftain"—to see in him a dangerous rival; and then he falsifies himself, and proclaims Gen. Jackson unworthy of public confidence; imputes to him crimes he never committed, apparently under an impression, that the people have so far lost their recollections and their intelligence, as not to be able to detect his hypocritical sinuosities, and to fathom his sinister and unwholly designs. Mr. Adams too, to whom the business of defending Gen. Jackson's conduct during and after the late war imparted "peculiar satisfaction"—who repeatedly declared that General Jackson's "whole career had been signalized by the purest intentions and the most elevated purposes;" who gave a splendid entertainment at his own house, in honor of General Jackson's patriotic and brilliant conduct on the 8th of January 1815, is now among those who hate and revile him. It is thus "mad ambition overleaps itself." But fellow citizens are you to be driven to and fro, like chaff before the wind, by men who are so palpably inconsistent and reckless. We are dwelling too long, however, on the inconsistency and duplicity of our opponents.

Let us examine some of the statements which stamp all the charges which their undated address

experience, abilities and virtue." The career of this young, but Herculean Republic, in prosperity and greatness has been too rapid, to be visibly and suddenly checked, by the efforts of a few misguided or corrupt men, in a few years. The seeds of our prosperity were sown by other men, and in other times. They have not yet been entirely uprooted. For this we have to thank the American people who have elected to congress a decided majority of men opposed to the present administration. The truth of this remark, we shall proceed to demonstrate.

You are told in Mr. Farnham's undated address that your land debt, "which once threatened to involve your families in impoverishment and ruin, has by the mild operation of a beneficent government been extinguished and by the present chief magistrate, every cent of money which the settler or purchaser of public lands may have forfeited has been restored to him, and he is now enabled to receive for his forfeited money its full value in land at congress price." This is a gross and daring attempt to deceive you, to bribe you to vote for Mr. Adams, by falsely representing him as the champion of your private interests. You all know that the system of extending relief to the purchasers of public lands had its origin in the administration of Mr. Monroe, and that it has since been perpetuated and extended by Congress, and not by the president. It has been a Jackson congress that has granted you lands at the minimum price, in lieu of your forfeited money—and not the apostate Federalist, who now holds the station of President in opposition to the public will.

The continuation of the Cumberland road through our state, and the extensive grants of land for the Michigan road and the Wabash canal are also mentioned in Mr. Farnham's address, as acts of President Adams! And the credit of them is appropriated exclusively to the present administration!!

The faith of the government has been pledged for many years, for the continuation of the Cumberland road; and it has been continued by successive acts of congress—not by the president. Appropriations for this purpose could only be constitutionally made by congress. It is therefore drawing too largely upon the supposed ignorance and credulity of the people of this state, when an attempt is made to persuade them, that Mr. Adams caused the Cumberland road to be continued through Indiana. The man who urges such an idea, must act upon the hypothesis, that the people are fools, prepared to give credence to any tale, however improbable or preposterous.

For the grant of land for the Michigan road and Wabash canal, you are certainly far from being indebted to Mr. Adams, or to any member of his cabinet. Nothing like a suggestion, of the propriety of appropriating any portion of the national domain to such objects can be found in any one of the messages of Mr. Adams, or any report made by either of the heads of the Departments of Government. In Rush's late report, on which the supporters of Mr. Adams rely, for evidence of Mr. Adams' devotion to the American System, the policy of holding up the western public lands, to discourage persons from purchasing, and emigrating from the northern states, is strongly urged, as a measure that would serve to render the population of the eastern states dense, lessen the value of labor, and thereby tend to encourage manufacture! Mr. Rush makes the following remarks in his Report of the 10th December last "there is an inducement to increased legislative protection to manufacturers in the actual internal condition of the U. States, which is viewed with an anxiousness belonging to its peculiar character and intrinsic weight.

It is that which arises from the great extent of their unsold land." "The manner in which the remote lands of the U. States are selling and settling, whilst it may probably tend to increase more quickly, the aggregate population of the country, and the mere means of subsistence does not increase capital in the same proportion. It (the mode of selling the public lands) has served, and still serves, to draw in an annual stream, the inhabitants of a majority of all the states, including amongst them at this day, a portion not small, of the western states, into the settlement of fresh lands, lying still farther and farther off. If the population of these states, not yet redundant in fact, though appearing to be so under his legislative incitement to emigrate, remained fixed in more instances, as it probably would, by extending the motives to manufacturing labor, it is believed the nation at large would gain in two ways: 1st by the more rapid accumulation of capital; and next by the gradual reduction of the excess of its agricultural population over that engaged in other vocations. And as it is the laws that have largely, in effect, throughout a long course of time, superinduced disinclinations to manufacturing labor, is the mode of selling of the public domain, the claim for further legal protection to the former kind of labor, at this day, seems to wear an aspect of justice no less than of expediency."