

MR. CALHOUN.

We have read the address of this gentleman to the people of the United States.

The first impression made upon our mind, is one of wonder, that a man possessing Mr. Calhoun's tact and prudence, should have brought a subject of this nature before the public. The only point in this discussion, except such as Mr. Calhoun has himself created, is altogether personal. By his private letters, and those of Mr. Monroe, by his whole public conduct, and by publications in the newspapers, general Jackson had been led to believe, that he had been uniformly his friend, in the cabinet of Mr. Monroe as well as out of it, vindicating all his conduct in the Seminole campaign. Under this impression, he had given Mr. Calhoun his warmest friendship and firmest confidence. Compelled at length, by facts and circumstances, to doubt the sincerity of his supposed ancient friend, he determined to know the truth. With this view, he obtained in an authentic shape, the charges which had been made of Mr. Calhoun's course in the cabinet, so different from what he had supposed, submitted them directly to the person implicated, and asked whether they were true? Mr. Calhoun admits their truth. Gen. Jackson expresses his surprise at the admission, and says Mr. Calhoun has pursued a course of duplicity towards him. The latter declares the charge of duplicity to be unfounded. With this issue the correspondence closed.

What was there in this which required an appeal to the public? It was a mere private difference. It concerned only the breaking of two gentlemen towards each other. One of them, it is alleged, had deceived the other, who had just found it out. By an interchange of letters, these gentlemen finally understood each other.

What have the public to do with gen. Jackson's and Mr. Calhoun's opinion of each other? Are they called upon to decide whether Mr. Calhoun was guilty of duplicity or not? gen. Jackson says he was. He says he was not. Whether he was or was not, does not now concern the public. Mr. Calhoun's publication, therefore, was wholly uncalled for. It is a firebrand wantonly thrown into the republican party. Mr. Calhoun will be held responsible for all the mischiefs which may follow.

The character which the President now ascribes to Mr. Calhoun will not derive any relief from this correspondence and its publication.

What was it which gen. Jackson asked of Mr. Calhoun in his letter of 13th May, 1830? Simply to state whether he had actually pursued the course ascribed to him by Mr. Crawford in Mr. Monroe's cabinet. He did not call in question his acts or his motives. All he wanted to know, was the truth or falsehood of a single proposition. It required not five lines to answer the inquiry. It was only necessary for Mr. Calhoun to say, "I did move and speak against you in Mr. Monroe's cabinet," or "I did not." This was all the President asked.

How does Mr. Calhoun answer this inquiry? An honest, plain man would pronounce sentence against him from the mere length of his reply! It occupies nearly six columns in the Telegraph, and twelve pages in a large pamphlet! A correspondence which, necessarily, embraced only one short question and a shorter answer, is made, by Mr. Calhoun, to cover nearly three pages of the U. S. Telegraph, and fill a large pamphlet of fifty two pages! Is there not something suspicious in the very length of Mr. Calhoun's reply, and the accumulation of his documents?

But the considerate reader will find this first impression confirmed by a perusal of the papers.

Instead of a direct and frank *yea or nay* to the inquiry, he begins by denying his responsibility to the President for what passed in Mr. Monroe's cabinet. Who said he was responsible? Not the President, nor any one else. He does not intend, he says, to offer apologies or excuses for his conduct. Who asked him for apologies or excuses? Nobody. The President only asked what that conduct was?

He then affects not to understand the President; but supposes he means that they did not put the same construction upon his orders in the Seminole campaign, and that he has been guilty of some duplicity in that respect. The President's letter was a direct inquiry of Mr. Calhoun, whether his course had been hostile to him in Mr. Monroe's cabinet, as was represented. He did not ask how Mr. Calhoun understood his orders, nor whether they understood them alike. He only desired to know, whether he had been secretly hostile, while professedly and publicly his friend. But Mr. Calhoun, instead of answering directly, leads off into a long discussion about the orders

and the manner in which they were understood, points which were not at all involved in the inquiry to which he was replying?

After wasting several pages in this unnecessary discussion, he comes at length to his own course in the cabinet. Here again, instead of a direct answer he fills the better part of a page in softening the admission, that Mr. Crawford's statement is substantially TRUE! He says to the President, "I was of the impression that you had exceeded your orders"—"I came to the meeting [of the cabinet] under the impression that the usual course ought to be pursued in this case, which I SUPPORTED BY PRESENTING FULLY AND FREELY ALL THE ARGUMENTS THAT OCCURRED TO ME."

Here the charge, so far as the President is concerned, was admitted to be true.

No room for controversy was left, except in relation to Mr. Calhoun's conduct towards gen. Jackson. The general says to him, in all your letters to me, you professed to be my personal friend, and approved ENTIRELY my conduct in relation to the Seminole campaign."

That the President was deceived, we have his positive declaration, supported by his conduct from the close of Seminole campaign, down to the present moment. In addition to private assurances, a letter from Washington was published in a Nashville paper, soon after the cabinet council, stating, that Mr. Crawford had moved his arrest in the cabinet, but that he was triumphantly defended by Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Adams. From the tone of Mr. Calhoun's own letters, and the letters of the President, gen. Jackson could entertain no doubt of this fact. So firmly was it impressed upon his mind that Mr. Calhoun had been his foremost advocate, that, on his way to Washington, when his conduct was in question before Congress, at a public dinner in Virginia, he toasted "John C. Calhoun" as "an honest man, the noblest work of God." He always supposed Mr. Crawford to be his only enemy in Mr. Monroe's cabinet, and openly gave vent to his feelings. All this Mr. Calhoun permitted in silence.

After his confession, he attempts to show that Mr. Crawford has given a false account of some minor incidents connected with this affair. That, Mr. Crawford and his friends will probably settle with him; but what if Mr. Crawford is mistaken on those points? Does it in the least affect Mr. Calhoun's conduct towards gen. Jackson? What if Mr. Crawford was not actuated, in disclosing this matter, by the motives he adduces;—does that prove that Mr. Calhoun did not make gen. Jackson believe he was his friend, when, in fact, he was secretly acting as his enemy? Or, if gen. Jackson's confidential letter to Mr. Monroe was not before the cabinet;—does that prove Mr. Calhoun innocent of the charge the President makes against him?

Having led the reader an useless journey over these subjects, he begins to complain of the manner in which the truth has finally reached the President's ear! He is very curious to know the names of every body who has heard or said a word about it. Does he want somebody to attack for the purpose of leading off the public mind from an unbiased view of his own conduct? The knowledge of names, he says, is important.

Now, does he pretend that the persons whose names were withheld, knew any thing about his conduct in Mr. Monroe's cabinet, or his intercourse with gen. Jackson? Not at all. But he seems to think they had some personal motive in bringing the truth to the knowledge of the President. If it were so, would it alter the fact? Would it at all extenuate his own conduct?

But he has the names. In gen. Jackson's letter to Mr. Forsyth, dated 7th June, 1830, a copy of which was sent to him, and in gen. Jackson's letter to himself, dated 19th July, he is distinctly told, that the statement referred to in Mr. Crawford's letter, came from col. Hamilton, of New York. It cannot be otherwise understood, than that this statement is a letter from Mr. Forsyth to col. Hamilton, which was referred to Mr. Crawford before it was submitted to the President.

In his long letter he then proceeds to mention a letter written by Mr. Crawford to maj. Barry in 1828, urging him to use his influence with the Kentucky electors not to vote for Mr. Calhoun. Now, what had this to do with the question? Does it show that Mr. Calhoun had not pursued a course of duplicity in that respect. The President's letter was a direct inquiry of Mr. Calhoun, whether his course had been hostile to him in Mr. Monroe's cabinet, as was represented.

Mr. Calhoun's part of this correspondence is singular enough. Instead of giving a direct answer to the President's inquiry, he throws in a pile of extraneous matter. He discusses his responsibility, gen. Jackson's orders, Mr. Crawford's veracity, the manner in which the President has at length

arrived at the truth, and many other things, not tending to throw light on the subject, but to involve it in darkness. The plain old Soldier tells him, he has nothing to do with all this; that by his own admission of his conduct in Mr. Monroe's cabinet, he finds he has deceived him, and he wants to hear no more about it.

And what apology does Mr. Calhoun make for bringing all this mass of matter before the public? Why, he says his conduct in Mr. Monroe's cabinet has been called in question and misrepresented? Who has called that conduct in question? Not the President. He has only called in question Mr. Calhoun's conduct towards himself. Mr. Calhoun is his own accuser before the public. He has called his own conduct in question before that tribunal. He is both accuser and defendant, and will have all the benefit of the verdict.

Nor is the second reason given by him for this wanton publication a whit better. He insinuates, that the President had divulged the affair before his arrival in Washington last December, so that it had become a topic of conversation and discussion in the newspapers.

Now, we happen to know, that the President's enemies in the west were in possession of all the facts embraced in this correspondence, of the letters, if not of copies, last summer! They did not derive their intelligence from the President or his friends at Washington.

Moreover, it is well known, that soon after Mr. Calhoun's arrival here, the correspondence was by him, put into the hands of members of Congress for perusal, and that nightly meetings were held for reading and explaining. Mr. Calhoun's particular friends have, long since, in their private letters, as we well know, been attempting to make impressions abroad on this subject favorable to him and injurious to others. The allegation that it is not the "controversy of two individuals" but a matter between him and his constituents, is equally unavailing. He well knows, that no-body has called in question his official acts or motives. General Jackson has asked what his acts were? He has not censured him for those acts. He only blames him for making him believe that his acts were different.

In addition to these reasons for bringing this matter before the public, Mr. Calhoun charges Andrew Jackson with participation in a political intrigue to compass his destruction commencing as early as 1827! On what authority does he predicate this bold charge? On a letter from Mr. Crawford to Alfred Balch, Esq. of Nashville, dated 14th December, 1827, in reply to a letter from that gentleman suggesting the propriety of his making known publicly his preference for General Jackson. Mr. Crawford declines a public expression of his opinion; but says, "the vote of the State of Georgia will, as certainly as that of Tennessee, be given to General Jackson, in opposition to Mr. Adams. The only difficulty that this State has upon that subject, is that if Jackson should be elected, Calhoun will come into power." And he closes the letter by saying, "If you can ascertain that Calhoun will not be benefited by Jackson's election, you will do him a benefit by communicating the information to me." This letter, it is alleged, was shown to general Jackson. Of this we doubt; but what if it were? Did he promise that Calhoun should not be benefitted by his election? It is not pretended. Did not the electors of Tennessee vote for Calhoun as Vice President? They did. Was he not supported by gen. Jackson's friends every where, except in Georgia? He was. Did not gen. Jackson's friendship for him remain unimpaired until the year 1829 when circumstances induced him to think he was mistaken in Mr. Calhoun's character? It did. Why, then, does Mr. Calhoun put this letter almost in the front his book, preceded by his own dark insinuations? As well might he charge Major Barry and all those to whom Mr. Crawford wrote with the view of defeating Mr. Calhoun's election, and all those to whom the letters were shown, with intriguing to produce his political destruction?

This has the appearance of another effort to lead off the public mind and break the force of his own exposure. Lest too much should be said or thought about his own conduct towards gen. Jackson, he, perhaps, wishes to set the people to thinking and talking about something else.

The Doctor comments on our knowledge of legislation, and says the senate's bill was not stricken out in the house, but only amended. We will readily admit his superior knowledge of the rules of the house, but must crave the liberty to say, that matters of *fact* do not alter matters of *fact* in our estimation—the very thing we wish to come at. We cannot see what difference it makes, whether the senate's bill was stricken out, or amended to resemble that of the house. The fact we wish to show is, did Dr. Ferris, after his vote and protest, against one bill, turn round and support another similar but more objectionable in its provisions? Mr. Pollock's letter, which the Doctor does not pretend to controvert, establishes this fact in such a manner as to admit of no doubt.

The Doctor refers to the forth coming journals, with no little complacency, to sustain him. Has he forgotten the senatorial campaign of 1828? These memorials of official conduct failed him then; and may we not, judging by the past, anticipate the same result in 1831? We make no threat, no promise, but merely throw out this hint,

as we understand it. It is only so far as it effects the President that we feel any interest about it.

Washington city Globe, Feb'y 19

without knowing whether the Doctor will be a candidate. We presume, however, that the same itching for office that has for years distinguished him as a *public man*, will again break out. Like the ghost of the murdered Banquo, he is frequently up, nor will be down, for friend or foe, until he is propitiated by a fat office.—Defeat only gives him greater zest for the pursuit.

One more point in the Doctor's article and we shall dismiss him for the present. He endeavors to produce the belief that Dearborn is well provided for under the present law. Does the Doctor wish to add insult to duplicity? Do not the provisions of the law show that some counties with 5 and 600 polls have a representative assigned them; while Dearborn, neglected and insulted Dearborn, with 2742 polls, has only 3 members allowed her in the lower house? It is also well known to the Doctor, that while Dearborn has a surplus over her senatorial ratio, other counties are allowed one with two thirds her number of polls. With these facts staring him in the face, it is vain to preach up that this county has her just weight assigned her in the law that has passed.

MARRIED—On the 10th inst. by the Rev. Mr. Scovel, Miss *Elizabeth Bedford* to Mr. *Jared Percival*—all of this place.

Land for Sale.

By virtue of a decree of the Dearborn circuit court, will be offered for sale at the court house door, on the 9th of April next, between 10 and 11 o'clock on said day, in the town of Lawrenceburg, Indiana, to the highest bidder for cash in hand, all that certain tract of land situate on the Ohio river, about five miles below Lawrenceburg, in the county of Dearborn, bounded as follows, beginning at the lower line of fractional section number 4, town 4, range one west, where the same strikes the Ohio river, thence with said line to the south west corner of said section, two hundred and ninety seven poles, thence with the west side of said fraction to the division line between Horsley and Swing, as agreed upon and Surveyed by Jesse L. Holman, thence with the said division line north seventy five degrees east, one hundred and fifty seven poles to the Ohio river, thence down the same to the place of beginning; containing one hundred and twenty three acres and ninety three and one half poles, being the lower part of said fractional section.

JOHN M'PIKE,
JOHN WEAVER,
JOHN SPENCER,
January 21, 1831.

S-W-8

Regimental Order.

55th Regiment of Indiana Militia; Lawrenceburg, Feb'y 26, 1831. COMMANDANTS of companies will muster their companies agreeably to law in the months of April, May and October, 1831. Those belonging to the 1st battalion, at Oliver Heustis's on the 30th of May, to perform battalion duty. Those belonging to the 2d battalion, at the public square in the town of Lawrenceburg, on the 31st of May, to perform battalion duty.

Those belonging to the 55th regiment will meet at Jacob Dils's, on the 26th day of October, to be mustered, reviewed and inspected. By order of the brigadier general.

Those whose duty it is to perform regimental drill, will meet at Jacob Dils's on the 2d and 3d days of September.

The court of assessment of fines, will be held at the same place on the 1st Monday in November, 1831—Court of Appeals same place, on the 1st Monday in December, 1831.

In consequence of the court of appeals for 1830 having neglected or failed to meet and hold said court at the time pointed out by law, all concerned are hereby notified and directed to meet at the said Dils's on the 1st Monday in December next.

The field officers, captains and commanders of companies, are hereby directed to meet at the house of Jacob Dils, on the 19th day of March next, to alter company bounds, set off new companies, attach light companies, and to perform all other business necessary to be done. By order of

JOHN SPENCER, Col.

Com'dt 55th R. I. M.

LIBORERS WANTED on the Ohio & Erie canal.

THE subscriber (residing at Portsmouth, on the Ohio, 115 miles above Cincinnati,) wishes to employ a large number of laboring hands, to whom he will give good wages and constant employment during the season. He also wishes to engage

15 OR 20 TEAMSTERS for the season, to whom he will give \$12 per month, and board. In all cases it is expected that hands engaging for the season, either as teamsters or common laborers, will faithfully fulfil their engagements to entitle them to the highest rates of wages.

LEMUEL MOSS.

March 5, 1831

9-15.

Administrator's Notice. ALL persons indebted to the estate of *ELEANOR HIGGINS*, deceased, late of Craig township, Switzerland county, are requested to make immediate payment; and all persons having claims against the same will present them for examination. The estate is solvent.

JOHN HIGGINS,

Administrator.

Printer's Retreat, March 2, 1831. 10-8w.

Notice to Trustees. The Trustees of Lawrenceburg township are requested to meet at the office of J. W. Hunter, esq. on Wednesday next, at 10 o'clock a. m. to transact township business.

March 12. D. V. CULLEY, clk.