

answer that I gave what I understood to be the substance of your conversation. I did not pretend to quote your language.

I regret that I misunderstood you in the slightest degree; I, however, stand corrected, and cheerfully accept the interpretation you have given to your own expression.

I shall freely continue my best exertions to discharge the duties of the Department, until you provide a successor.

I have the honor to be, with the greatest respect your obedient servant.

JOHN BRANCH.

To the PRESIDENT, U. S.

Washington, April 20, 1831.

Sir: Late last evening, I had the honor to receive your letter of that date, tendering your resignation of the office of Secretary of the Navy.

When the resignation of the Secretary of State and Secretary of War were tendered, I considered fully the reasons offered, and all the circumstances connected with the subject. After mature deliberation, I concluded to accept those resignations. But when this conclusion was come to, it was accompanied with a conviction that I must entirely renew my Cabinet. Its members had been invited by me to the stations they occupied—it had come together in great harmony, and as a unit. Under the circumstances in which I found myself, I could not but perceive the propriety of selecting a Cabinet composed of entirely new materials, as being calculated in this respect at least, to command public confidence & satisfy public opinion. Neither could I be insensible to the fact, that to permit two only to retire would be to afford room for unjust misconceptions and malignant misrepresentations concerning the influence of their particular presence upon the conduct of public affairs. Justice to the individuals whose public spirit had impelled them to tender their resignations, also required, then, in my opinion the decision which I have stated. However painful to my own feelings, it became necessary that I should frankly make known to you my view of the whole subject.

In accepting your resignation, it is with great pleasure that I bear testimony to the integrity and zeal with which you have managed the concerns of the Navy. In your discharge of all the duties of your office, over which I have any control, I have been fully satisfied; and in your retirement you carry with you my best wishes for your prosperity and happiness. It is expected that you will continue to discharge the duties of your office until a successor is appointed.

I have the honor to be, with great respect your most obedient servant.

ANDREW JACKSON.

JOHN BRANCH, Secretary of the Navy.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Palladium.

Fellow Citizens. I am fully aware that many objections will be raised, in the outset, to the manner in which the ticket just nominated for the support of the friends of general Jackson, has been brought before us. The object of this address is to show you the expediency and necessity of unity and exertion. In the present great division of the people, on men and measures, it is to be expected that partisans will support those friendly to the measures by them advocated.

The friends of Henry Clay will leave no exertion untried to elect candidates friendly to the "star of the west." Their ranks are perfectly organized and officered. Every office in the state is in their hands, and they wield all the influence, thence derived, to retain their power. That this organization exists, we both see & feel. A large and overwhelming majority of enemies to the administration are elected, and the voice of the great majority of the people is unheard in the legislature. This is effected by their organization, and its operations are carried on in secret, but yet not less sure in their effect.

It therefore becomes necessary for us to oppose force to force, and openly oppose the enemies of the administration, by the most salutary means. The first thing necessary to effect this is to unite upon some individuals, in whom we have confidence, and give them our undivided support at the next election. This is the only means by which we can exert our strength with effect, or hope to elect our candidates. The opposition will and do unite, and we must follow their example. This being absolutely necessary, the only difficulty is, as to the manner in which the candidates are to be brought before the people. Every part of the state hath certain local rights, in the location of officers, which ought to be observed. In representing the county, each township hath an inalienable right, in rotation with the others, of sending a member; Lawrenceburgh, being one of nine townships, has generally sent the greater part of the mem-

bers to both houses of the legislature. Whence did this arise? Had none of the other townships men fit to represent us? I will not insult the other townships by even the supposition; it arose from the want of unity amongst the people, and from there being more of that "modest merit," which is ever obtruding itself, in its readiness to serve upon the people, and which will not take no, for an answer: have we not had standing candidates almost from time immemorial, who are always on the carpet, who will not even wait to be asked? A delegation of three from each township, to meet for the purpose of agreeing on a ticket, is the only mode by which the local rights of the different townships can be preserved, and a proper distribution of the representatives can be made. These delegates elected in the primary assemblies of the people, have certainly the best opportunity of selecting a ticket, when it becomes necessary to unite upon one.

A man by self-nomination, divests himself of that modesty which waits till community calls for his services. When a few voters recommend a man, it follows that but a small part of community are interested in the act; perhaps but one, or perhaps the individual himself.

Our ticket has been formed of men, decided men, who are willing to stand or fall upon the question;—and it is with its friends to say, whether they will support, or desert those measures which they have professed to admire in the administration. We hear the cry of "no question" raised by the friends of Henry Clay, and we regret to have it echoed by our friends. Why, I would ask you, is it that no question exists? Have our political relations changed since 1824? Did we not see the will of the great majority trampled on by this same party of whom Henry Clay is the idol of adoration?—Are they any more to be trusted than at that time, or in 1823?

Since then we have been content to unite with the party of Clay and let not the presidential contest interfere with our state elections, and what has been the consequence? A minority, an acknowledged minority by thousands of voters, has ruled the state and distributed every office amongst themselves. The question must not be heard of at the election, but when elected and the power in their hands, it has been exercised. And shall we be made any longer dupes? Did not the friends of Henry Clay have a large majority in the house last year, and was not every office in their gift conferred on the friends of our bitterest enemy? Are we patiently to submit to this? Are the honest yeomanry of the country, the farmers and working men, who hold a large majority, calmly to see an unprincipled aristocracy take away by stealth their rights and privileges? Shall they see that to be a friend of Jackson amounts to a prohibition of all honors, at the hands of the people? I think it is impossible. That as they huddled from the seats of power that band, who by bargain and intrigue opposed the will of the people of the United States, they will now in like manner cast off the knot, who are striving to hold the power, the influence, and offices of this state, the better to succeed in their purposes of electing a man to the highest office in the gift of the people, who has long since been weighed and found wanting.

The crisis has arrived for all the friends of order, all who wish to support our able administration, to unite to ensure its continuance, and protect it in the discharge of its duties. A powerful party, composed, as they vainly say, of all the wealth, and all the talents, have combined against the man of the people: 500 presses, composing nearly all the papers of the union, are opening their batteries on him, while he stands as firm and collected, and presents his breast to the storm, as manly as when opposed to the invincibles of Wellington. And shall we leave him to fight the battle alone? Shall we meanly desert in the hour of trial the aged veteran and permit his enemies to gather their forces for his destruction?

We must no longer be deluded by the cry of "no question;" men must be elected friendly to the great measures of the administration, if we wish them to co-operate.

Can the great system of reform in the government be perfected, while those who have been guilty of the excesses are called on to assist? Can we expect them to be their own executioners? The opposition are sworn to put the Hero down, and shall we assist at the sacrifice? No; our duty calls us again to the field of war. The enemy, though once routed, must be again overthrown. The same unceasing abuse, which has been levelled for years against the venerable head of our government, is still continued. The great "star of the west," hath, like Sirius, shed its malignant influence upon us, threatening disease, destruction, and death.—We have seen Henry

Clay wandering like a discontented spirit through our land, denouncing "war, pestilence, and famine." We have seen him mount the rostrum, and in presence of assembled multitudes, hurl his anathemas at the President of twelve millions of free men; and shall we join hands with the friends of the bold calumniator of gen. Jackson, and assist them in their avowed object of putting him down?—No; if we are his friends, the time has arrived to show it by uniting in the firmest bands.

We have seen the aged patriot, whom we have delighted to honor, assailed in a manner unprecedented in the annals of political warfare. They have invaded the sacred sanctuary of his home, and dragged from thence the aged partner of his bosom, exposing her to the vulgar gaze of an unfeeling world. We have seen this most amiable, virtuous and pious woman, led up as a sacrifice on the altar of ambition; and yet we are called on to coalesce with a party who justify all means by the end.—Who pursue the object of their hate broken hearted to the grave. By whom no age, no sex is spared—from whom the tomb can only protect a woman bent with age and grey with years. Theirs is a more cruel than Cossack, Indian, or even Russian warfare.

It has truly been said by our late representative, that our internal and national affairs were never more prosperous; that our navy rides triumphant in every sea, protecting our commerce and commanding respect from the nations of the earth; that our manufactures are flourishing; our internal improvements progressing. Is it not, I would ask, our duty to preserve in its purity a government under which we are, by the acknowledgment of its bitterest enemy, thus prospering?

Let us therefore all unite as one man in the support of men that are friendly, and that decidedly, to gen. Jackson. Let us redeem the state from the thralldom under which it has too long and too patiently travailed. Let us cast off old officers who have sat in office so long as to claim it as matter of right, and will soon esteem it as hereditary.—Let the principle of reform pass thro' our land and work a thorough reformation. We have too long been led like sheep to the shambles, by designing men who barter and distribute the offices in our gift, and call on us to ratify the contract.—Let us cast off this worse than English vassalage—and let no longer a friendship to Jackson amount to a complete disfranchisement.

Clinton.

For the Palladium.

Mr. Editor—Agreeably to promise I now proceed to notice the communication of "Facts." At first view one would suppose that I had a difficult case to manage, for it is almost universally admitted that "facts are stubborn things." It is, however, my consolation that fictitious facts are not real facts, and it is with the former that I have to contend. To proceed—"Facts" says, "I confess I was somewhat surprised at his notions of the ad valorem system of taxation;" as though I had formed a very erroneous idea of what I had undertaken to advocate. But is it indeed a fact? What is the definition of the term ad valorem? Is it not according to the real value? It most assuredly is. How then did it happen that my "notions" surprised him? Did I not say that each individual should be taxed according to the just valuation of all of his real and personal property—money at interest not excepted? Is such a notion as this of the ad valorem system calculated to "surprise" common intelligence? Or did "Facts" mean to say that for once in my life I had a correct view of what I had taken in hand, consequently "he was somewhat surprised?" One of the two must be the fact, unless he designed to slay the whole communication at once, by causing the "good people" to believe that I had used a great deal of deception. It is not very material to me which or what, so that my notions are correct. And "Facts" admits that they are about in accordance with the notions of all who favor the system. Why, then, did he not say that he was somewhat surprised that I had espoused such a cause, instead of saying he was somewhat surprised at my notions of it?

Again—he says "they raise the hue and cry &c., and then, with all the pretended solemnity of honest politicians, mount their popular hobby, (the ad valorem system of taxation,) the true spirit of which with its tendencies they (I, of course, among them) do not understand, or conceal from the good people." Now to say that I am guilty of pretended solemnity, and of pretending honesty, as a politician, merely because I am unfavorable to the present mode of taxation, is ungenerous and uncalled for; neither is it a fact. In my communication I was careful to remark that I would not be understood to say that those who have hitherto acted or voted against this measure, have acted corruptly. It may have

been the result of an honest difference of opinion. And I still say so, and if I have erred it has also been the result of an honest difference of opinion.—But of all men in the world what hobby did I ever mount?—But is the ad valorem system, indeed, a popular hobby? Then I marvel not that "Facts" was somewhat surprised at my "notions," for I expressed a different sentiment and repeat it. But that it will be popular not many years hence, I entertain few doubts. But why should I not understand its true spirit and tendencies? I was born under it—and raised under it. But what are its tendencies? Is it not the more one possesses the more tax he must pay? And vice versa. But what have I concealed from the good people? Did I not say that the individual who possesses most should pay most, and in just such proportion? Ignorant of what I had taken in hand, I concealed from the good people, is a charge as far from the fact as it is from Maine. It is in reality any thing but a fact. Again he says, "on first sight of Mr. Cotton's production I thought some remark necessary, but the want of time and ability caused me to defer it."

Now had he made his remarks on sight it would have been some apology for his hard sayings and SOFT arguments. To use the express words of "Facts," "I have thought proper to submit this communication, not from any personal feelings except of the best kind—but from an honest difference of opinion, which will not lessen my friendship."—And why should it? I am at an utter loss to conjecture who my opponent is, and I presume that I shall never know. But to proceed. "Facts" says, "and now for the details of his law: 'Lands with the improvements thereon, horses, and oxen are the subjects of taxation; and Farmer jr. embraces horses, oxen, houses and lots. If these are separate writers it shows how well the friends of what is called the ad valorem system agree in what ought to be subjects of taxation, under their hobby; but if the same, it shows that he forgets houses and lots in his former.'" Now, in this paragraph, that "Facts" did not understand what he read and what he quoted, or that he wished to "conceal some thing from the good people," is a stubborn fact.—First he would have you understand that I would have all of the tax upon lands, with their improvements, horses and oxen. But is it a fact that these comprise all real and personal property—money at interest not excepted? Is it not a plain fact that I used a few particulars merely for the sake of illustration? Neither is it a fact that he quoted me in full. Did I not say a small log cabin and the most splendid buildings? But suppose that these were all that I would have taxed, is it a fact that Farmer and I disagree about the subjects of taxation? We both use horses and oxen, and what, I would ask, is the difference between a log cabin and a most splendid building or a house? And is not a lot, land? So that it is not a fact that we disagree in our illustrations. I, however, disclaim the communication of Farmer, jr. neither do I know him. Farmer's communication went to show that Mr. Armstrong had been perfidious—he and Mr. Armstrong for that. Mr. Armstrong violated no pledges to me; neither did he make any to my knowledge. I contended against "measures and not men." It also shows, says "Facts," how well we agree upon the ad valorem system, as though we had differed as wide in notions as we should be apart if I were to go to Maine and he to Mexico. That we, and all its real advocates, do agree is an incontrovertible fact. And it is a fact worthy of remark that we perfectly agree in our illustration. Neither is it a fact that I omitted houses and lots in my former. But says "Facts" "the industrious farmer feels its pressure." But is it a fact that these are the most wealthy class of community? The rich, whether farmer, mechanic, or merchant will have an increase of tax; but they will feel no pressure, unless strict justice is oppressive. But he asks "what encouragement is there for a man to try to do well?" Is justice calculated to discourage a man from doing well? Who of us would refuse a good 100 dollar job, because we should have to pay 50 cents tax, when we could loan the money for 30 or 35 dollars per annum? By a parity of reasoning, what encouragement under our present law? I answer none. The man who is industrious and temperate, and toils hard by night and day, must be taxed for it, or if he has horses, oxen, waggons, or watches, he must be taxed for them—in other words, for his industry. His intemperate and slothful neighbor owns not a foot of land, and in reality nothing but poverty and rags, and he gets clear of tax, except for poll. Is it a fact then that the industrious would have no encouragement to do well, because they were more fortunate than many, consequently must pay more tax? But "the speculator's land in an unimproved state must be valued accordingly." Now this a fact, and how else should it

be valued? But "he pays nothing for his thousands in his pocket;" neither should he, for while it is there it is worth nothing. Again—the man "with perhaps 10 or 50 acres of land, perhaps in debt to half of its value, will pay as much tax as the former." Well, suppose two men have each 500 dollars which they dispose of for a farm; one purchases all unimproved land, the other gives all for 50 acres well improved. Suppose again, that they pay each an equal tax, the fact is that would be right exactly. But then it is not half paid for is the objection. Well what better is the present law? Do not men often purchase horses upon a year's credit and have to pay tax for them when they are in debt for the whole? It is a fact they do. But again, "Facts" says his little farm, &c. must be valued and what is gained by it? I answer justice and equality. If his land is valuable he pays accordingly, and he ought to do so; if it is poor he pays but little, and bad enough at that. I speak on general principles. "Facts" says it is against the towns principally that the clamor is directed. They have, fine buildings, and pay nothing for them. Now this is not the fact. Are fine houses real and personal property? Are they money at interest? And are there no fine houses in the country? The fact is there are. But says "Facts," "I question if the ad valorem system so called (but why so called) in its full extent will remedy the evil, (mark in its full extent,) and unless it is carried to its full extent, it is the most unjust system that can be adopted." Now if it is not carried to its full extent it will not answer the purpose, and if it is carried to its full extent it is no better. Here is something, that needs explanation. "And even then the evils will overbalance the good." Perhaps hereafter when I have time I will make this proposition good." What proposition, I would ask, will "Facts" make good? Will he indeed make it appear that the evils in the MOST unjust system that can be adopted, will more than overbalance the good? Sage discovery!!! I wonder how "Facts" will make his proposition good? What, the evils in the MOST unjust system that can be adopted more than overbalance the good!!! But again—"Facts" says lands are taxed according to their quality and situation; but it is like many of his other facts. That lands are taxed according to 1st, 2d, & 3d rates in an unimproved state, I am ready to admit as a fact. But there are quarters of 3d rate land which is in reality worth more each than half a score of other quarters of the same rate. Nor is it a fact that they are taxed according to their situation. Some lands are situated on a public high way, near to a good market, perhaps in a village with a church, school house, and a mill near at hand; while other lands of the same rates are located in the forest far from a road and other accommodations, and yet are taxed as high as the former. What then could "Facts" mean by saying that they were taxed according to their quality and situation? Every one knows that it is a fact that they are not. And so with his watches and other articles of taxation. If it is a gold watch, worth 20 dollars, he must pay as much tax as though it was worth ten times that amount. Now will it satisfy the demand of justice to say none escapes this unequal system of taxation? No, sir justice revolts at the idea. "Facts" has made some snog calculations and tells you that it will cost 30 times as much to make out the duplicate for Dearborn as it does now. It will no doubt cost more than it now does, but are we to tolerate injustice, gross injustice, because it will cost a little more to have ample justice done? No sir. But if the system which costs the least to make out the duplicate is the best one, then sir let me suggest an amendment; say tax every man \$2, and then I can make out every man's tax in the county in two minutes, and thereby save the 125 dollars of what it now costs. Another fact is, it will require no lister under the ad valorem system; the appraisers take down the property on sight, otherwise how could they appraise it? Nor will it be necessary to appraise oftener than once in 5 or 5 years. But another objection is the old counties will have an increase of tax and the new ones realize a corresponding reduction. The fact is that is the way that it should be. Is a young farmer able to pay as much tax as an old one? Ought he to pay as much? No, sir, justice revolts at the idea. Neither ought the new counties to pay as much as the old ones. The individual who has no other views of correct policy than how he shall get most and keep it, is unworthy the name of "a republican." Had our ancestors acted upon this principle, we should have but little to do with how revenue ought to be raised. But they were republicans of sterling worth, they sought not their own but the public good. Nor do I advocate the ad valorem system, because I expect to profit by it, but because I think it just