

*Continued from first page.*

quires, I think I have heard it stated, something like 100,000 employees to have it executed. And, notwithstanding the modesty of the infant promises of this new project, I have no doubt that ultimately we shall have to employ a number of persons approximating to that which is retained in France. That will undoubtedly be the case whenever we shall revive the system of informal taxation. In France, what reconciled them to the system was, that Napoleon first, and the Bourbons afterwards, were pleased with the immense patronage which it gave them. They liked to have 100,000 dependents to add strength to the throne, which had been recently constructed or reassembled. I thought, however, that the learned chairman of the Committee of Finance must have had some other besides the French model for his receivers general and, accordingly, upon looking into Smith's history of his own State, I found that, when it was yet a colony, some century and a half ago, and when its present noble capital still retained the name of New Amsterdam, the historian says, "Among the principal laws enacted at this session, we may mention that for establishing the revenue, which was drawn into precedent. The sums raised by it were made payable into the hands of receivers general, and issued by the Governor's warrant. By this means the Governor became, for a season independent of the people, and hence we find frequent instances of the Assemblies contending with him for the discharge of debts to private persons contracted on the faith of the Government." The then Governor of the colony was a man of great violence of temper, and arbitrary in his conduct. How the sub-treasury system of that day operated the same historian informs us in a subsequent part of his work. "The revenue," says he, "established the last year, was at this session continued five years longer than was originally intended. This was rendering the Governor independent of the people. For, at that day, the Assembly had no treasure but the amount of all taxes went, of course, into the hands of the receiver general, who was appointed by the Crown. Out of this fund, moneys were only issuable by the Governor's warrant, so that every officer in the Government, from Mr. Blauthwait, who drew annually five per cent. out of the revenue, as auditor general, down to the meanest servant of the public became dependent, solely, of the Governor. And hence we find the House, at the close of every session, humbly addressing his Excellency, for the trifling wages of their own clerk." And, Mr. President, if this measure should unhappily pass, the day may come when the Senate of the United States will have humbly to implore some future President of the United States to grant it money to pay the wages of its own sergeant-at-arms and doorkeeper.

Who, Mr. President, are the most conspicuous of, who perseveringly pressed this bill upon Congress and the American people? Its drawer is the distinguished gentleman in the white house not far off; its endorser is the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, here present.—What the drawer thinks of the endorser, his cautious reserve, and stilled enmity prevents us from knowing. But the frankness of the endorser, has not left us in the same ignorance with respect to his opinion of the drawer. He has often expressed it upon the floor of the Senate.—On an occasion not very distant, denying to him any of the nobler qualities of the royal beast of the forest, he attributed to him those which belong to most crafty, most skulking, and one of the meanest of the quadruped tribe. Mr. President, it is due to myself to say that I do not altogether share with the senator from South Carolina in this opinion of the President of the United States. I have always found him, in his manners and deportment, civil, courteous, and gentlemanly; and he dispenses, in the noble mansion which he now occupies, one worthy the residence of Chief Magistrate of a great people, a generous and liberal hospitality. An acquaintance with him of more than twenty years duration has inspired me with a respect for the man, although, I regret to be compelled to say, I detest the Magistrate.

The eloquent Senator from South Carolina has intimated that the course of my friends and myself, in opposing this bill, was unpatriotic, and that we ought to have followed in his lead; and, in a late letter of his, he has spoken of his alliance with us, and of his motives for quitting it. I cannot admit the justice of his reproach. We united, if indeed, there were any alliance in the case, to restrain the enormous expansion of Executive power; to arrest the progress of corruption; to rebuke usurpation; to drive the Goths and Vandals from the capital; to expel Brennus and his horde from Rome, who, when he threw his sword into the scale, to augment the ransom demanded from the mistress of the world, showed his preference for gold; that he was a hard money chieftain. It was by the much more valuable metal of iron that he was driven from her gates. And how often have we witnessed the Senator from South Carolina, with woful countenance, and in doleful strain, pouring forth touching and mournful eloquence on the degeneracy of the times, and the downward tendency of the republic? Day after day, in the Senate, have we seen the displays of his lofty and impassioned eloquence. Although I shared largely with the Senator in his apprehension for the purity of our institutions, and the permanency of civil liberty, disposed always to look at the brighter side of human affairs, I was sometimes inclined to hope that the vivid imagination of the

Senator had depicted the dangers by which we were encompassed in somewhat stronger colors than they justified. The arduous contest in which we were so long engaged was about to terminate in a glorious victory. The very object for which the alliance was formed about to be accomplished. At this critical moment the Senator left us; he left us for the very purpose of preventing the success of the common cause. He took up his musket, knapsack and shot pouch, and joined the other party. He went horse, foot, and dragon, and he himself composed the whose corps. He went, as his present most distinguished ally commenced with his expounding resolution, *soldier and alone*. The earliest instance recorded in history, within my recollection, of any ally drawing off his forces from the combined army, was that of Achilles at the siege of Troy. He withdrew his troops, and remained in the neighborhood in sullen and dignified inactivity. But he did not join the Trojan forces, and when during the progress of the siege, his faithful friend fell in battle, he raised his avenging arm, drove the Trojans back to Troy, and satisfied his vengeance, by slaying Priam's noblest and dearest son, the finest hero in the immortal Iliad.—But Achilles had been wronged, or imagined himself wronged, in the person of the fair and beautiful Briseis. We did no wrong to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. On the contrary we respected, confided in his great and acknowledged ability, his uncommon genius, his extensive experience, his supposed patrism; above all, we confided his stern and inflexible fidelity. Nevertheless, he left us, and joined our common opponents, distrustful and distrusted. He left us, as he tells, in his Edgefield letter, because the victory which our common arms were about to achieve, was to ensure to him and his party, but excluded

*(Concluded on second page.)*

### CIRCULAR.

To the Voters of Knox, Martin and Davis Counties.

Respected fellow-Citizens.

It is a true and a true saying, that "one strong man above his fountain head." In nature it is literally true, *taut in science*, in ethics, in morals, in politics and in government, it is equally true, but in a different sense. In government of the *monarchical* fountain, the fountain of all authority is the crowned head of a single individual.

—His will is the law of his subjects; they are his slaves. They live not for themselves; for their own honor and happiness; but for his, who sways the sceptre over them. But in Republics, —of which our own happy government is one—the fountain is with the people. The people elevate one man and put down another. It is theirs to speak out in command and from the Clerk Magistrate down to the lowest officer of state and town, the house—*the trusted here*—must be submissively and obey implicitly their sovereign voice. They must do it—it is their duty to do it; and if they feel at that their privilege, they are unworthy of being honored and trusted by the people. Hence all laws that are legitimately passed, whether in our national or state legislatures, are but an expression of the people's will.

Entertaining and cherishing these views, in conformity with the practice of my honored predecessors, as one of your servants in the state legislature, permit me to offer for your acceptance the following statement of my acts, and the reasons which have guided me during our last session, of watchfulness and tell, which has now but just closed.

The first matter of general interest which occupied the attention of your legislature was that of *Internal Improvements*. From the reports and extracts made of the money already expended on the works begun, and from the estimates of future costs, it appeared manifest, I think, to the warmest advocates of the original system, that it could not be fully executed without incurring the state in debt, far beyond her present means to pay. The question then came up, What shall we do?—Shall we classify—dropping for the present some of the public works which the state has pledged her faith to construct? No. This we could not do. We could not sacrifice the interests of any section without its consent. As the golden mean, therefore between a strict adherence to the original system as adopted in 1830, and classifying, a *modification* of the original system received my vote, which, while it changes the character of some of the works and lessens their expense to the state some millions of dollars, and thus guarantees their speedy completion, it takes not without giving something as an equivalent in return. For instance, in the original act of 1830, to provide for a general system of Internal Improvements, section 4th provides for a rail road from Madison through Columbus, Indianapolis, and Crawfordsville to Lafayette; also for a re-survey of the route from Jeffersonville via New Albany, to Louisville, Benton, Bloomington, and Cincinnati to Crawfordsville; and it found practicable to construct a Rail Road from New Albany through Greenup, Paducah, Mount Pleasant, and Washington to Vincennes.—From the report made it was found *practicable* to construct a Rail Road from Jeffersonville to Crawfordsville on the route re-surveyed; and it might have been *practicable* to have constructed a Rail Road from New Albany to Vincennes. Why, therefore was not the latter as well as the former provided for? Why should Jeffersonville and Crawfordsville, and Madison and Indianapolis, have Rail Roads, and not New Albany and Vincennes? I voted for making all *Madisonian* Turnpikes from beginning to end, with the exception only of the distance between New Albany and Jeffersonville. Here I voted for the Rail Road. Is it asked why this exception? I answer, While the three great roads starting from Madison, Jeffersonville and New Albany, and Vincennes, I voted for making all *Madisonian* Turnpikes from beginning to end, with the exception only of the distance between New Albany and Jeffersonville. Here I voted for the Rail Road. Is it asked why this exception? I answer, While the three great roads starting from Madison, Jeffersonville and New Albany and running into the interior, should compete more or less with one another, and therefore would be, in my judgment, of the same character, and the road from Jeffersonville to New Albany, lying on the Ohio river, on the Indiana side, will compete with the Louisville and Portland Canal on the Kentucky side. It is important to Jeffersonville—it is important to New Albany—and I may say—it is important to our state that between these points there be a Rail Road. This road being complete, boats coming down from Pittsburgh may stop at Jeffersonville and unload, and boats coming up the river and landing on New Albany, may as well use the Rail Road to Jeffersonville to transport whatever is designed to go above the Falls, either to Madison or into the interior of our state; as to use the Portland Canal to Louisville—why, they may better use the Rail Road. The modification of the Jeffersonville and Crawfordsville road, which I suggested passed, and thereby five millions of dollars

were saved to the state; and you, fellow citizens, were saved thereby a heavy load of taxes; which I knew you had not the disposition, nor the ability to pay. While I voted for a thorough change of the Madison and Lafayette Road, it may be known to many of you that in so doing I voted much against my own pecuniary interests, and that of many of my friends; but I considered it for your interests that it be thoroughly changed. The change however was effected only in part—from Madison to Indianapolis the rail road is changed from a double to a single track of track; and thence to Lafayette, it is to be a common Turnpike. Some two or three millions of dollars are probably saved to the state by this change, I supported also the bill for reducing the number of the board of Public Works from nine to five, believing that five competent persons might do all the duties of nine quite as well, and about half the expense. I am not for doing what is, that already sufficiently reduced; nor would I retain any model excessiveness to the body politic, \$71,488, for the expenses of this board, and \$1,000, for the clerk of the session, is asking rather too much of the state's blood for one year—an amount something over the whole expense of sustaining our state Government. A comparison might here be instituted between the expenses of our board of Pub. Works and that of Pennsylvania or New York, but I forbear—the number is not lessened, and we must bear the burden as well as we can.

The next engrossing subject which came before us, was, *"The Revision of the Laws."* The last preceding revision was made in the year 1831, since which time the laws of seven sessions had accumulated in annual pamphlets, and amendments upon amendments upon some acts, till it was not an easy matter, for the great body of the people (for whom the law was made) to tell what the law was. Besides a few parts of the revised code of 1831 now remain on hand. A new edition if not a revision, was indispensably needed to supply the wants for public use. Near the close of the session of 1837, a Joint Resolution—passed the legislature, committing this work to the Judges of the supreme court—but that the said Judges failed to execute a revision and had they done so, the necessity of a strict examination of all and every part of the *revisions, alterations, amendments, abridgments, enlargements, modifications, and introductions of a character* would not have been suppressed by the Legislature, in order for them to become the law of the state—my vote, therefore was given for—*The General Assembly of the state of Indiana* to take this work in hand itself, *ab initio* from the beginning. Our stay was prolonged but a few days, if at all, by this revision; and it is probably as well done by the Legislature, with the assistance of a few qualified Clerks, as if we had paid six thousand dollars to the supreme Judges for doing it to be done over again by ourselves.

The subject of *"The State Tax Law"* was the next engrossing matter—in a very subordinate matter, too. On this subject I was in favor of an investigation, hoping that when tried, it would come forth like gold. The sentiments of the majority of the Indiana Committee in the senate, as expressed in their Report on this great Corporation, in the midwest were my own, and in conformity with these sentiments all my votes relating to this institution, had been given.

It may not be out of place to observe, in passing, that the state laws were under revision, a bill was presented to the senate by your humble servant, providing for the action of one of the execs. of the law in any township, in case of the death or removal of the other, and in case of the occurrence of any vacancy of both execs., that it be filled immediately by the Board doing every thing to do it, and if they feel at that their privilege, they are unworthy of being honored and trusted by the people. Hence all laws that are legitimately passed, whether in our national or state legislatures, are but an expression of the people's will.

Entertaining and cherishing these views, in conformity with the practice of my honored predecessors, as one of your servants in the state legislature, permit me to offer for your acceptance the following statement of my acts, and the reasons which have guided me during our last session, of watchfulness and tell, which has now but just closed.

The first matter of general interest which occupied the attention of your legislature was that of *Internal Improvements*. From the reports and extracts made of the money already expended on the works begun, and from the estimates of future costs, it appeared manifest, I think, to the warmest advocates of the original system, that it could not be fully executed without incurring the state in debt, far beyond her present means to pay. The question then came up, What shall we do?—Shall we classify—dropping for the present some of the public works which the state has pledged her faith to construct? No. This we could not do. We could not sacrifice the interests of any section without its consent. As the golden mean, therefore between a strict adherence to the original system as adopted in 1830, and classifying, a *modification* of the original system received my vote, which, while it changes the character of some of the works and lessens their expense to the state some millions of dollars, and thus guarantees their speedy completion, it takes not without giving something as an equivalent in return. For instance, in the original act of 1830, to provide for a general system of Internal Improvements, section 4th provides for a rail road from Madison through Columbus, Indianapolis, and Crawfordsville to Lafayette; also for a re-survey of the route from Jeffersonville via New Albany, to Louisville, Benton, Bloomington, and Cincinnati to Crawfordsville; and it found practicable to construct a Rail Road from New Albany through Greenup, Paducah, Mount Pleasant, and Washington to Vincennes.—From the report made it was found *practicable* to construct a Rail Road from Jeffersonville to Crawfordsville on the route re-surveyed; and it might have been *practicable* to have constructed a Rail Road from New Albany to Vincennes. Why, therefore was not the latter as well as the former provided for? Why should Jeffersonville and Crawfordsville, and Madison and Indianapolis, have Rail Roads, and not New Albany and Vincennes? I voted for making all *Madisonian* Turnpikes from beginning to end, with the exception only of the distance between New Albany and Jeffersonville. Here I voted for the Rail Road. Is it asked why this exception? I answer, While the three great roads starting from Madison, Jeffersonville and New Albany, and running into the interior, should compete more or less with one another, and therefore would be, in my judgment, of the same character, and the road from Jeffersonville to New Albany, lying on the Ohio river, on the Indiana side, will compete with the Louisville and Portland Canal on the Kentucky side. It is important to Jeffersonville—it is important to New Albany—and I may say—it is important to our state that between these points there be a Rail Road. This road being complete, boats coming down from Pittsburgh may stop at Jeffersonville and unload, and boats coming up the river and landing on New Albany, may as well use the Rail Road to Jeffersonville to transport whatever is designed to go above the Falls, either to Madison or into the interior of our state; as to use the Portland Canal to Louisville—why, they may better use the Rail Road. The modification of the Jeffersonville and Crawfordsville road, which I suggested passed, and thereby five millions of dollars

were saved to the state; and you, fellow citizens, were saved thereby a heavy load of taxes; which I knew you had not the disposition, nor the ability to pay. While I voted for a thorough change of the Madison and Lafayette Road, it may be known to many of you that in so doing I voted much against my own pecuniary interests, and that of many of my friends; but I considered it for your interests that it be thoroughly changed. The change however was effected only in part—from Madison to Indianapolis the rail road is changed from a double to a single track of track; and thence to Lafayette, it is to be a common Turnpike. Some two or three millions of dollars are probably saved to the state by this change, I supported also the bill for reducing the number of the board of Public Works from nine to five, believing that five competent persons might do all the duties of nine quite as well, and about half the expense. I am not for doing what is, that already sufficiently reduced; nor would I retain any model excessiveness to the body politic, \$71,488, for the expenses of this board, and \$1,000, for the clerk of the session, is asking rather too much of the state's blood for one year—an amount something over the whole expense of sustaining our state Government. A comparison might here be instituted between the expenses of our board of Pub. Works and that of Pennsylvania or New York, but I forbear—the number is not lessened, and we must bear the burden as well as we can.

The next engrossing subject which came before us, was, *"The Revision of the Laws."* The last preceding revision was made in the year 1831, since which time the laws of seven sessions had accumulated in annual pamphlets, and amendments upon amendments upon some acts, till it was not an easy matter, for the great body of the people (for whom the law was made) to tell what the law was. Besides a few parts of the revised code of 1831 now remain on hand. A new edition if not a revision, was indispensably needed to supply the wants for public use. Near the close of the session of 1837, a Joint Resolution—passed the legislature, committing this work to the Judges of the supreme court—but that the said Judges failed to execute a revision and had they done so, the necessity of a strict examination of all and every part of the *revisions, alterations, amendments, abridgments, enlargements, modifications, and introductions of a character* would not have been suppressed by the Legislature, in order for them to become the law of the state—my vote, therefore was given for—*The General Assembly of the state of Indiana* to take this work in hand itself, *ab initio* from the beginning. Our stay was prolonged but a few days, if at all, by this revision; and it is probably as well done by the Legislature, with the assistance of a few qualified Clerks, as if we had paid six thousand dollars to the supreme Judges for doing it to be done over again by ourselves.

The subject of *"The State Tax Law"* was the next engrossing matter—in a very subordinate matter, too. On this subject I was in favor of an investigation, hoping that when tried, it would come forth like gold. The sentiments of the majority of the Indiana Committee in the senate, as expressed in their Report on this great Corporation, in the midwest were my own, and in conformity with these sentiments all my votes relating to this institution, had been given.

It may not be out of place to observe, in passing, that the state laws were under revision, a bill was presented to the senate by your humble servant, providing for the action of one of the execs. of the law in any township, in case of the death or removal of the other, and in case of the occurrence of any vacancy of both execs., that it be filled immediately by the Board doing every thing to do it, and if they feel at that their privilege, they are unworthy of being honored and trusted by the people. Hence all laws that are legitimately passed, whether in our national or state legislatures, are but an expression of the people's will.

Entertaining and cherishing these views, in conformity with the practice of my honored predecessors, as one of your servants in the state legislature, permit me to offer for your acceptance the following statement of my acts, and the reasons which have guided me during our last session, of watchfulness and tell, which has now but just closed.

It may not be out of place to observe, in passing, that the state laws were under revision, a bill was presented to the senate by your humble servant, providing for the action of one of the execs. of the law in any township, in case of the death or removal of the other, and in case of the occurrence of any vacancy of both execs., that it be filled immediately by the Board doing every thing to do it, and if they feel at that their privilege, they are unworthy of being honored and trusted by the people. Hence all laws that are legitimately passed, whether in our national or state legislatures, are but an expression of the people's will.

### STOVES! STOVES!

Evansville Sept. 2, 1837.



#### Combination Stove.

Dear Sir. My family have for a length of time been using Phelps' Cooking Stove, with which they were well pleased; indeed I believed myself that its utility could not be surpassed, if equal, but of late we have had an opportunity to test the qualities of another, "the Combination stove," called Town's Patent improved by M. French, and have found that it is far superior to the one first mentioned.—

In answer to my inquiries, my family say, that they, can cook faster, better and with less fuel and trouble, than they could with the other stove. I can only account for the difference in this way, that the improved stove is so constructed, that you can control the temperature at pleasure, without changing the furniture on the stove, therefore the articles cooked are not damaged by too great a heat, nor is the heat wasted by being misapplied.

I make this statement that the world may be benefited by it, as well as the vendors of the improved stove.

W.M. TRAFTON.

Mrs. Ira French.

We, the undersigners, are using the combination Cooking Stove, called Town's patent, improved by M. French. We have no hesitation in saying, that for convenience and expedition in cooking, and for the saving of fuel, it far surpasses any cooking stove now in use. We therefore cheerfully recommend it as a very valuable improvement.

W.M. K. HAM,

A. P. HUTCHINSON,

A. H. LAMAN,

JOHN A. CURL,

A. YOUNGS.

Mr. Carmel, October 4th, 1837.

Mr. French.

Sir:—The stove I bought of you (the Combination stove) is superior to any I have seen, and from inquiry, I believe superior to any now in use. My family are well pleased with theirs.

Yours, P. H. BAGWELL.

The subscriber having the exclusive right of making and vending the above stove, keeps it constantly on hand. The Comical Stove he also keeps—a very cheap and convenient cooking stove.

ALSO A GREAT VARIETY OF SHOP PARLOR STOVES,

which he pledges himself to sell at the Louisville and Cincinnati prices. The public are particularly invited to call and examine the Patent Combination stove.

Sept. 28th, 1837.—23-1f.

—IRA FRENCH.

—NEW-FIRM

Tin & Sheet Iron Manufact.

—