

## COMMUNICATIONS.

### FOR THE PALLADIUM.

"The galled jade will wince."

MR. EDITOR: In looking over "Liberty's" first communication, I came to the conclusion that he had the promontory symptoms of insanity upon him, and I would advise his friends to put him in a straight jacket, and confine him till after the August election. I am somewhat acquainted with the gentleman, and know that his disorder, generally, increases as the election approaches, till he will get "in a very bad way." Just before sitting down to write this communication, the last Palladium was handed me; I read the second communication of "Liberty," which goes to strengthen me in my former opinion.

"Liberty" thinks it is but just to compare the tales of Homespun with facts, "and see if they are not the production of some demagogue" &c. So do I think; but where are his facts? for, in the elegant language of "Liberty," the wool is so completely pulled over my eyes, that I have not been able to discover them.

"Liberty" seems to think "that National Republicans are not party Republicans." Now this is only a new edition of the old story, which they have told for years, and when they will quit it, Heaven only knows. That they are not "party Republicans," (the leaders I speak of,) nor any other kind of Republicans, is certainly true; but Federalists. It is a well known fact that the old federal party supported Mr. Clay for the presidency; but the name of Federal did not please them, therefore they took upon themselves the name of "National Republicans." I felt disposed to use the name which they as a —. What shall I call it? it will not do to say *party*. — Ah! it just struck me: well, as I said, I felt disposed to use the name which they as a party chose to go by. But, sir, I think it a wrong application of the term, as regards some of the no party folks, (let it here be distinctly understood that I believe that there are many of the supporters of Mr. Clay true Republicans,) and I would as soon suspect Liberty unworthy of that title as some others. When I see men of information, (I have no reference to Liberty,) after all the testimony that has been adduced against the bank—it's hostility to the government, &c., still clinging to her as they would to an idol, and try to hide her crimes, which she has committed against the American people, and use their utmost power to perpetuate her existence, at the risk of every thing that is or should be dear to the American citizen, I conclude that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark."

Liberty thinks that I should have recollected Gen. Jackson's letter before I attacked others who believe in the doctrine therein contained. I did not attack those that believe in that doctrine. If I attacked any body, it was those political shufflers, who wish, by intrigue and management, to get themselves or their political friends into office, in spite of the will of the majority.

"But sir," says Liberty, "did the result of the last August election, compared with the state of parties at the last presidential election, warrant Homespun in making such an assertion, or in giving such precautionary advice?" What assertion, Mr. Liberty? Where was it made? and at what time?—please not to be so vague—point out the assertion. Suppose I did give advice; what has "the result of last August election" to do with it? If I thought, from present appearances, that there was danger, I would certainly "warrant" me in giving advice, however plain and uncouth, without having any reference to last August election. But, sir, let "Liberty" make any thing he pleases out of the result of last August election, and I will "tot the mark with him."

Liberty charges me with making "palpable misstatements." Now, who will believe him without he makes it appear? This he has not attempted, for this very good reason: he knew he could not do it; therefore he is the one that is guilty of misstatements.

Again, Liberty says, "He advises them to do that," in principle, which he says flatly, "is not fair." No such thing; I never advised any body to proclaim a thing to deceive, and then act, *secretly*, to the reverse of it. This, sir, is what I said, "is not fair," and if Liberty's perception had not have been very obtuse, he would have understood it so.

The way Liberty answers my question "in the Yankee style," is a "sia to David Crockett." In answer to my question, which is as follows: "If they [the Nationals] mean to vote on party ground, why not come out boldly and say so?" he says, "Sir, I would answer his question, in the Yankee style, by asking another. Does Homespun think that men who believe, that all the officers from the president, down to the lowest township officer, should exercise the duties of their office with a single eye to the duties prescribed for them by the constitution and law, without asking or knowing who voted for them, or who did not, will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse, and purposes to act upon them, with a view to reward and punish all in their power?" I always thought that Yankees were like other folks, even if they had a shrewd way of answering questions, by asking others; that when they pretended to answer a question, if it was by asking another, they gave an answer to the question which was asked; not some one which was not asked.—Suppose, for instance, I should ask Henry Hopkins, Esq., of Manchester, why do not the Claymen declare openly and aboveboard what they intend to do? And he should say, I will answer your "question in the yankee style, by asking another." Do you think that men who believe so and so, will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse? Would I receive an answer to the question asked? I think not. The least that can be made of it, sir, is an improvement on yankee ingenuity; and I judge, that if "Liberty" had lived in Salem, in the days of witchcraft, and had invented this new mode of answering questions, he would have been burnt for a *witch*.

"Our whole country, and nothing but our country." As regards Liberty, and some others, he would have come higher the fact if he had said, "our whole Clay, the unconstitutional land-bill, national fast, *high or low tariff*, as he pleases, and all, and nothing but our Clay, to help us president Biddle."

The gentleman is altogether mistaken in presuming that I intend "to be up for office," or that I wish to have a particular friend elected, who has no merits of his own. But, sir, suppose that I do calculate to be up for office, all will agree that it is a good thing to know that I have not "merits," for men often render themselves very ridiculous by lacking this information: I once knew a candidate in this very "fix," who rode all over Dearborn county, exposing his own weakness, and just on the eve of the election his own political friends, who belonged to the no party, led him off the track; because he lacked bottom.

"Liberty" exclaims O! tempora! O! mores! What of the times and manners, my dear sir! Have you run for office and failed? Are the people so stupid as not to see your claims? Cheer up Mr. Liberty, president Biddle may do something for you. But, sir, I would gently whisper one thing in your ear—that is, if you calculate to spout Latin, be a little more particular in the arrangement of your English sentences. I will cite one or two of the many errors in your first production, trusting that it will make you more careful in future. "Will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse, and purposes to act upon them, with a view to reward and punish all in their power." "And as he knows that it won't do" &c. Now, if Homespun had committed

these errors, it would not have been wondered at; for he sets up no pretensions to learning. But, that a Latin scholar should be guilty of such gross mistakes, is certainly very strange.

Liberty supposes that I had two objects in view: the first I have noticed. "The second object, he says, is punishment for daring to assert the rights of freemen" &c. He has not the shadow of evidence, sir, for this charge. If I could be made to believe, that the policy which the National Republicans believe in, is the best, I would freely vote for them.—But as I believe that the Bank of the United States is at war with the Government, and if re-chartered, will in all probability, subvert our free institutions, and destroy the fairest fabric of human wisdom; and, as I believe that Mr. Clay's land-bill is unconstitutional, and, if it should become a law, would prove dangerous to these United States, who could think, if they believe me a friend to my country, that I would wish to see our State Senate and Legislature filled with the advocates of these measures? I have not yet forgot the case of the Legislature of Virginia, and Mr. Rives. Suppose the friends of the administration should neglect their duty all over the Union, and the no party folks should get a majority, in every Legislature and Senate, of their own friends.—What would be the consequence? Why our Senators would be instructed, and our Representatives requested to vote for the re-charter of the Bank, and Mr. Clay's land-bill, &c. If I disagree with a man in politics, I conclude it is good reason why I should not vote for him; for if I vote for him, I vote that his policy may be carried into effect. How does it look in the Nationals, after they have said that the policy which the Democratic Republicans hold to, will ruin the country, to wish to compromise with, and vote for these enemies of their country? It proves, beyond doubt, that they are very reckless, or are not sincere. Will any true friend of his country, vote for "Liberty" in a future No. of the Palladium.

HOMESPUN.

Manchester, April 7th, 1834.

### To the voters of Dearborn county.

FELLOW CITIZENS: In suffering my name to continue before you as a candidate for your suffrages, at the approaching August election, I deem it both idle and due to all concerned, that I should say a few words on reference thereto at this early day. Having been a candidate before you a number of times already, and having as often failed, it will doubtless be asked by some—what does the man mean? Does he intend to be a candidate forever? Will he take no denial? Why then does he wish to stand another poll? Has he not already fairly tested his political strength? These inquiries demand of me severally a categorical answer. In the first place I answer that I do not intend to be a candidate forever. I will take a *fair* denial—that is all I ask. I have not as yet fairly tested my political strength, as will be easily made to appear. This then is why I wish to stand another poll—this then is just what I mean. To give over the pursuit under these circumstances, and have it said that I could not be elected, when at each succeeding election I have made a handsome advance, properly considered, & with prospects infinitely more flattering than on any former occasion, is not perfectly congenial with my feelings—is that why few men would do. Reader, pause with care—weigh deliberately, and judge impartially upon the following expose, and then say whether I act prudently or imprudently in the course which I have marked out as the rule of my own action.—In '29 I stood a poll for Representative, and received just 200 votes—100 of which I received in Manchester. The year following I was re-nominated but declined, being at that time on the eve of departing to visit my parents and friends in Maine. While there I was put in nomination for associate judge and received 3 or 400 votes—in Manchester was second best. The whole was performed in my absence—I did not return until Nov. In '32 most unexpectedly the county convention gave me a nomination for seminary trustee. I should have declined but for the remonstrance of my friends, because I apprehended that the election would be both local and sectional—and so it was. Will any man suppose that 11 votes are all I could get in Laugherby township at a fair poll? No. Consequently I was defeated. Add to this, it may well be doubted whether it was possible to have found another man in the county better known and more justly respected, and better qualified for the office, than the gentleman with whom I had to compete; and with all, he was one of my most respected friends, and is to this day, notwithstanding he was elected over me with a majority of from one to two hundred votes; yet, in our own district I received more than two to one votes. Last year I stood a poll for Representatives being the second time for that office, and received 838 votes—201 of which I received in Manchester; which, when compared with the first result, would stand thus: In Manchester, in '29, 100—in '33, 201—a little more than two to one.—In the county in '29 200—in '33, 838—a little more than four to one; in all, a net advance of 638. I now ask in candor is that not a pretty fair advance? Would any man who had ever suffered his name to be thus used abandon the field without a third effort? But let him be aware of the third.—Fellow citizens, am I too aspiring in calmly submitting my claims to your consideration once more? If so, proclaim it at the ballot box and it shall suffice, (for the present at least.) But should you decide in my favor, I frankly declare that I will not cling to office "with a life tenure." And here let me ask you to consider the disadvantages under which I laboured last year. As my luck would have it, there were two opposing candidates; consequently, as the people thought me or Heustis, the Manchester man, and the most likely to succeed, as they voted; and as a consequence, we were both defeated—that difficulty cannot exist this year—the question is fairly settled through the ballot box.

My friends, in the different townships, tell me that if it had been known that I should have run so well at home, I should have been elected without a remaining doubt. Others have had the frankness to say that they did not vote for me, because they had been made to believe that I was far from being the choice of Manchester. They were willing to give Manchester one Representative and no more, and they wished to go with her in the selection. What could be more honorable? This I believe to be the true merits of the case. I believe either Heustis or I should have been elected single handed. Both running was the misfortune. I deem it due to myself to say that I should not have been a candidate, had not Mr. H. assured me in the most unequivocal terms, that he should not be a candidate—we talked the subject over more than once. It was with surprise that I learned from him that he should "go ahead," a few weeks only before the election. I had then gone too far to decline, else I should have done so. I did not become a candidate to oppose him; nay I was his friend, and viewed him as being mine. In fine, it was had management, without bad intention. We defeated each other unintentionally—let that suffice. I do not attribute my defeat to any political party management. Some of the most prominent Clay men were among my most zealous supporters. This I know to be a fact. For

instance in Jackson township I received every vote excepts. There is, in all probability, three times that number of Clay men in Jackson; nor is it probable that every Jackson man voted for me. In fine, I was as well pleased with the result as I could well be, and not be elected. I suppose I should have liked a little better, and not so very little neither. However an election this year would do me better, but there is some thing in getting it—that is the rub. Be that as it may the voluntary assurances which I continue to receive from different parts of the county since the last election, and not unfrequently from those who then opposed me, warrant the belief that if I can ever be elected, it will be the present year; and hence I wish to try my luck once more, and be done with it. This is a fair explanation of my case.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

With respect A. J. COTTON.

Manchester, April 10, 1834.

P. S. Should the county seat question be made the pivot on which the election is to turn, that is to say, if there is to be two full tickets made out—the one pledged for and the other against "Removal," I shall postpone my claims, if any I have, until the storm is blown over. My friends, therefore, will make no effort in my favor until that point is settled, at which time they may hear from me again. I shall at present simply let my name remain until a direction is given to that subject. And should I see my way clear to "go ahead," I intend neither to write, say, or do much in an electioneering line of business—shall passively submit my case without much debate—shall diligently apply myself to the cultivation of my farm—let opposing candidates alone—speak evil of none, without just provocation, that is to blazon their real faults. If I am elected, let it be the free will offering of the people, founded upon my own humble merits, and on merit alone.

Will the editors of the "Statesman" and the "Rising Sun" give the above an insertion in their respective papers without delay? and oblige

A. J. COTTON.

### United States Bank.

The vexed question of the removal of the Directors has at length been settled in the House of Representatives—the *Previous Question* has been moved and sustained. In the National Intelligencer of the 5th inst. we have the proceedings in the House on the preceding day—of which we make a summary.

*Columbus Sentinel.*

The resolutions reported by Mr. POLK, from the Committee of Ways and Means, on the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the amendment of the same offered by Mr. WILDE (of Georgia,) declaring the reasons of the Secretary unsatisfactory, being the question pending—at a quarter past 4 o'clock Mr. D'UFFEY concluded a speech against the removal of the Deposits—in favor of the amendment, and in favor of the Bank; when Mr. MASON (of Virginia) obtained the floor, and moved the *Previous Question*. The motion, which requires a majority of the House to second it was sustained—*Ayes 114, Nays 105.* Mr. VANCE, the house being late, moved an adjournment—negative, *Yeas 103, Nays 110.* Other motions followed, which were also negative.

The *Previous Question* cutting off the amendment, Mr. WILDE inquired if it would be in order to move to suspend the rules of the House, so as to obtain a direct vote on his amendment. The *Chair* decided in the negative; and, further, explained that the question now was, only whether the Main Question itself would be susceptible of division, so as to get a separate vote on each of the resolutions.

"The *Previous Question* was now put as follows:

"Shall the main Question now be put?" and decided by yeas and nays as follows: *Yeas 116, Nays 107.* [The vote of the Indiana delegation on this question was as follows: *Yeas—Messrs. Boon, Carr, Hannegan, Kinnard & Lane. Nays—Messrs. Ewing, and McCarty.*]

So the House determined that the Main Question should now be put.

The Main Question was then put, viz: will this House concur with the Committee of Ways and Means, in the resolutions reported by them to to obtain a direct vote on his amendment.

Mr. WILDE demanded that the question should be divided, so as to take a vote separately on each resolution.

It was decided accordingly; and put, first, upon concurring in the first of the resolutions reported; viz:

"Resolved, That the Bank of the United States

ought not to be re-chartered."

The question was decided by yeas and nays as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. John Adams, William Allen, Anthony, Archer, Beale, Bean, Beardsley, Beaumont, John Bell, Blair, Bockee, Bon, Bouldin, Brown, Bunch, Bynum, Cambreleng, Carmichael, Carr, Casey, Chaney, Chinn, Clairbone, S. Clark, Clay, Clayton, Clewney, Coffey, Connor, Cramer, W. R. Davis, Davenport, Day, P. Dickerson, D. W. Dickinson, Dunlap, Felder, Forster, Foster, W. K. Fuller, Fulton, Galbraith, Ghoslon, Gillet, Gilmer, Gordon, Grayson, Griffin, Joseph Hall, Thompson, Harrison, Hathaway, Hawkins, Heath, Henderson, Howell, Hubbard, Abel Huntington, Inge, Jarvis, R. M. Johnson, Noah Johnson, Cave Johnson, Seaborne Jones, Benjamin Jones, Kavanaugh, Kinnard, Lane, Lansing, Laporte, Lawrence, G. W. Lay, L. Lee, T. Lee, Leavitt, Loyall, Lucas, Lyon, Lytle, A. Mann, Jr., J. K. Mann, Mardis, John Y. Mason, Moses Mason, Jr., McIntire, McKinney, McKinley, McLeane, McVean, Miller, Henry Mitchell, Robert Mitchell, Mullenberg, Murphy, Osgood, Page, Parks, Parker, Patterson, Pearce, Peyton, Pierce, Pierson, Pinckney, Plummer, Polk, Rencher, Schenck, Schley, Shinn, Smith, Speight, Standifer, Stoddert, Sutherland, W. Taylor, W. P. Taylor, F. Thomas, Thomson, Turner, Turrill, Vanderpool, Wagener, Ward, Wardwell, Wayne, Webster, Whallom—135.

NAYS—Messrs. John Quincy Adams, H. Allen, John J. Allen, Chilton Allan, Ashley, Banks, Barber, Barnitz, Barringer, Baylies, Beatty, James M. Bell, Binney, Briggs, Bull, Burges, Cage, Chambers, Choate, William Clark, Corwin, Coulter, Crane, Crockett, Darlington, Amos Davis, Deberry, Deming, Denny, Dennis, Dickson, Duncan, Ellsworth, Evans, Edward Everett, Horace Everett, Fillmore, Foot, Philander C. Fuller, James Graham, George Grennel, Hiland Hall, Gideon Hard, Hardin, James Harper, Hazeltine, Jabez W. Huntington, Jackson, William Cost Johnson, Lincoln, Martindale, Marshall, McCarty, McComas, McDuffie, McKenna, Mercer, Milligan, Moore, Pope, Potts, Reed, W. B. Shepard, A. H. Sheppard, W. Slade, C. Slade, Sloane, Spangler, Philemon Thomas, Tompkins, Tweedy, Vance, Vinton, Watmough, E. D. Whipple, Frederick Whittlesey, Elisha Whittlesey, Wildes, Wilson, Young—82.

So the House concurred in the first resolution.

The second resolution was then read as follows:

"2. Resolved, That the public depositories ought

not to be restored to the Bank of the United States." And decided by yeas and nays as follows: *Yeas 119, Nays 104.* [The Indiana delegation voted as follows on this question: *Yeas—Messrs. Boon, Carr, Hannegan, Kinnard, Lane & McCarty. Nays—Mr. Ewing.*]

The third resolution was then agreed to, as follows:

"3. Resolved, That the State Banks ought to be continued as the places of deposite of the public money, and that it is expedient for Congress to make further provision by law, prescribing the mode of selection, the securities to be taken, and the manner and terms on which they are to be employed."

The following is the third resolution:

"4. Resolved, That, for the purpose of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the cause of the commercial embarrassment and distress complained of by numerous citizens of the United States, in sundry memorials which have been presented to Congress at the present session, and of inquiring whether the charter of the Bank of the United States has been violated, and also what corruptions and abuses have existed in its management; whether it has used its corporate power or money to control the press to interfere in politics, or influence elections, and whether it has had any agency through its management or money, in producing the existing pressure, a select committee be appointed to inspect the books, correspondence, accounts and other papers connected with the management of business; and that the said Committee be required to report the result of such investigation, together with the evidence that may take, at as early a day as practicable."

And decided by Yeas and Nays as follows—*Yeas 174, Nays 41.* [On this question the Indiana delegation voted all in the affirmative.]

So the House concurred in the Fourth Resolution.

Mr. POLK moved that the Committee consist of seven members, which was agreed to.

Mr. WILDE asked consent to offer a 5th resolution, declaring the reasons offered by the Secretary insufficient and unsatisfactory.

Objections being made he moved to suspend the rules.

Mr. POLK thereupon moved to adjourn—on this Mr. WILDE demanded the Yeas and Nays, which were taken as follows—*Yeas 123, Nays 70.*

So the House at half past seven adjourned to Monday next."

### THE PRESSURE.