EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature, well or ill-conducted, is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown."
Religion purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us rich—and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all.

VOL. VIII. EASTON, (MARYLAND) SATURDAY EVENING, APRIL 16, 1825. NO. 18.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
EVERY SATURDAY EVENING BY
ALEXANDER GRAHAM,

At Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum payable half yearly in advance.

Advertisements not exceeding a square inserted three times for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion.

MR. CLAY'S ADDRESS.

To the people of the Congressional District composed of the Counties of Fayette, Woodford, and Clarke, in Kentucky.

[CONCLUDED.]

Whether Mr. Adams would or would not have been my choice of a President, if I had been left freely to select from the whole mass of American citizens, was not the question submitted to my decision. I had no such liberty: but I was circumscribed, in the selection I had to make, to one of the three gentlemen, whom the people themselves had thought proper to present to the House of Representatives. Whatever objections might be supposed to exist against him, still greater appeared to me to apply to this competitor. Of Mr. Adams, it is but truth and justice to say, that he is highly gifted, profoundly learned, and long and greatly experienced in public affairs, at home and abroad. Intimately conversant with the rise and progress of every negotiation with foreign powers, pending or concluded; personally acquainted with the capacity and attainments of most of the public men of this country, whom it might be proper to employ in the public service; extensively possessed of much of that valuable kind of information, which is to be acquired neither from books nor tradition, but which is the fruit of largely participating in public affairs; discreet and sagacious; he would enter on the duties of the office with great advantages. I saw in his election the establishment of no dangerous example. I saw in it, on the contrary, only conformity to the safe precedents which had been established in the instances of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and Monroe, who had respectively filled the same office from which he was to be translated.

A collateral consideration of much weight was derived from the wishes of the Ohio delegation. A majority of it, during the progress of the session, made up their opinions to support Mr. Adams, and they were communicated to me. They said, "Ohio supported the candidate who was the choice of Kentucky. We failed in our common exertions to secure his election. Now, among those returned, we have a decided preference, and we think you ought to make some sacrifice to gratify us." Was not much due to our neighbour and friend?

I considered, with the greatest respect, the resolution of the General Assembly of Kentucky, requesting the delegation to vote for General Jackson. That resolution, it is true, placed us in a peculiar situation. Whilst every other delegation, from every other state in the Union, was left by its Legislature entirely free to examine the pretentions of all the candidates, and to form its unbiased judgment, the General Assembly of Kentucky thought proper to interpose and to request the delegation to give its vote to one of the candidates, whom they were pleased to designate. I felt a sincere desire to comply with a request emanating from a source so respectable, if I could have done so consistently with those paramount duties which I owed to you and to the country. But, after full and anxious consideration, I found it incompatible with my best judgment of those duties to conform to the request of the General Assembly. The resolution asserts, that it was the wish of the people of Kentucky, that their delegation should vote for the General. It did not inform me by what means that body had arrived at a knowledge of the wish of the people. I knew that its members had repaired to Frankfort before I departed from home to come to Washington. I knew their attention was fixed on important local concerns, well entitled, by their magnitude, exclusively to engross it. No election, no general expression of the popular sentiment had occurred since that in November, when electors were chosen, and at that the people, by an overwhelming majority, had decided against General Jackson. I could not see how such an expression *against* him, could be interpreted into that of a desire *for* his election.

If, as is true, the candidate whom they preferred, was not returned to the House, it is equally true, that the *state* of the contest as it presented itself here to me, had never been considered, discussed, and decided by the people of Kentucky, in their collective capacity. What would have been their decision on this *new* state of the question, I might have undertaken to conjecture, but the certainty of any conclusion of fact, as to their opinion, at which I could arrive, was by no means equal to that certainty of conviction of my duty to which I was carried by the exertion of my best and most deliberate reflections. The letters from home, which some of the delegation received, expressed the most opposite opinions, and there were not wanting instances of letters from some of the very members who had voted for the resolution, advising a different course. I received from a highly respectable portion of my constituents a paper, instructing me as follows.—'We, the undersigned voters in the Congressional district, having viewed the instruction or request of the Legislature of Kentucky, on the subject of choosing a President and Vice President of the United States, with regret, and the said request or instruction to our representative in Congress from this district being without our knowledge or consent; we for many reasons known to ourselves, connected with so momentous an occasion, hereby *instruct* our representative in Congress to vote on this occasion agreeable to his own judgment, and by the best lights he may have on the subject, with, or without, the consent of the Legislature of Kentucky.' This instruction came both unexpected and unsolicited by me, and it was accompanied by letters assuring me, that it expressed the opinion of a majority of my constituents. I could not therefore regard the resolution as conclusive evidence of your wishes.

Viewed as a mere request, as it purported to be, the General Assembly doubtless had the power to make it. But then, with great deference, I think it was worthy of serious consideration whether the dignity of the General Assembly ought not to have induced it to forbear addressing itself, not to another legislative body, but to a small part of it, and requesting the members who composed that part, in a case which the constitution had confided to them, to vote according to the wishes of the General assembly, whether those wishes did or did not conform to their sense of duty I could not regard the resolution as an instruction; for, from the origin of our state, its legislature has never assumed nor exercised their right to instruct the Representatives in Congress. I did not recognize the right, therefore, of the Legislature to instruct me. I recognised that right only when exerted by you. That the portion of the public servants who made up the General Assembly have no right to instruct that portion of them who constituted the Kentucky delegation in the House of Representatives, is a proposition too clear to be argued. The members of the General Assembly would have been the first to behold as a presumptuous interposition, any instruction, if the Kentucky delegation could have committed the absurdity to issue, from this place, any instruction to them to vote in a particular manner on any of the interesting subjects which lately engaged their attention at Frankfort. And although nothing is further from my intention than to impute either absurdity or presumption to the General Assembly, in the adoption of the resolution referred to, I must say that the difference between an instruction emanating from them to the delegation, and from the delegation to them, is not in principle, but is to be found only in the degree of superior importance which belongs to the General Assembly.

Entertaining these views of the election on which it was made my duty to vote, I felt myself bound, in the exercise of my best judgment, to prefer Mr. Adams; and I accordingly voted for him. I should have been highly gratified if it had not been my duty to vote on the occasion; but that was not my situation, and I did not choose to shrink from any responsibility which appertained to your representative. Shortly after the election, it was rumored that Mr. Kremer was preparing a publication, and the preparations for it which were making excited much expectation. Accordingly, on the 26th February, the address, under his name, to the 'Electors of the ninth Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania," made its appearance in the Washington City, Gazette. No member of the House, I am persuaded, believed, that Mr. Kremer wrote one paragraph of that address, or of the plea, which was presented to the committee, to the jurisdiction of the House. Those who counselled him, and composed both papers, and their purposes, were just as well known as the author of any report from a committee to the House. The first observation which is called for by the address is the *place* of its publication. That place was in this city, remote from the centre of Pennsylvania, near which Mr. Kremer's district is situated, and in a paper having but a very limited, if any circulation in it. The *time* is also remarkable. The fact that the President intended to nominate me to the Senate for the office which I now hold, in the course of a few days, was then well known; and the publication of the address was, no doubt, made less with an intention to communicate information to the Electors of the ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, than to affect the decision of the Senate on the intended nomination. Of the character and contents of that address of Messrs. George Kremer & Co. made up as it is, of assertion without proof, of inferences without premises, and of careless, jocose and quizzing conversations of some of my friends, to which I was no party, and of which I had never heard, it is not my intention to say much. It carried its own refutation, and the parties concerned saw its abortive nature the next day in the indignant countenance of every unprejudiced and honorable member. In his card, Mr. Kremer had been made to say, that he held himself ready "*to prove*, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds, enough to satisfy them of the accuracy of the statements which are contained in that letter, *to the extent that they concern the course of conduct of H. Clay.*" The object for excluding my friends from this pledge has been noticed. But now the election was decided, and there no longer existed a motive for discriminating between them and me. Hence the only statements that are made, in the address, having the semblance of proof, relate rather to them than to me; and the design was, by establishing something like facts upon them, to make those facts re-act upon me.

Of the few topics of the address upon which I shall remark, the first is, the accusation, brought forward against me of violating instructions. If the accusation were true, who was the party offended, and to whom was I amenable? If I violated any instructions, they must have been yours, since you only had the right to give them, and to you alone was I responsible. Without allowing hardly time for you to hear of my vote, without waiting to know what your judgment was of my conduct, George Kremer & Co. chose to arraign me before the American public as the violator of instructions, which I was bound to obey. If, instead of being, as you are, and I hope always will be, vigilent observers of the conduct of your public agents, jealous of your rights, and competent to protect and defend them, you had been ignorant and culpably confiding, the gratuitous interposition, as your advocate, of the honorable George Kremer, of the ninth Congressional district in Pennsylvania, would have merited your most grateful acknowledgments. Even upon that supposition, his arraignment of me would have required for its support one small circumstance, which happens not to exist, and that is, the fact of your having actually instructed me to vote according to his pleasure.

The relations in which I stood to Mr. Adams constitute the next theme of the address which I shall notice. I am described as having assumed 'a position of peculiar and decided hostility to the election of Mr. Adams,' and expressions towards him are attributed to me, which I never used. I am made also responsible for 'pamphlets and essays of great ability,' published by my friends in Kentucky, in the course of the canvass. The injustice of the principle of holding me thus answerable, may be tested by applying it to the case of General Jackson in reference to publications issued, for example, from the Columbian Observer. That I was not in favour of the election of Mr Adams, when the contest was before the people, is most certain. Neither was I in favour of that of Mr. Crawford or General Jackson. That I ever did any thing against Mr. Adams, or either of the other gentlemen, inconsistent with a fair and honorable competition, I utterly deny. My relations to Mr. Adams have been the subject of much misconception, if not misrepresentation. I have been stated to be under a public pledge to expose some nefarious conduct of that gentleman, during the negotiation at Ghent, which would prove him to be entirely unworthy of public confidence; and that with a knowledge of his perfidy, I nevertheless, voted for him. If these imputations are well founded, I should, indeed be a fit object for public censure; but if, on the contrary, it shall be found that others, inimical both to him and to me, have substituted their own interested wishes for my public promises, I trust that the indignation, which they would excite, will be turned from me. My letter addressed to the Editors of the Intelligencer, under date of the 15th Nov. 1822, is made the occasion for ascribing to me the promise and the pledge to make those treasonable disclosures on Mr. Adams. Let that letter speak for itself and it will be seen how little justification there is for such an assertion. It adverts to the controversy which had arisen between Messrs. Adams and Russell, and then proceeds to state that 'in the course of the several publications, of which it has been the occasion; and, particularly, in the appendix to a pamphlet which had been recently published by the Hon. John Quincy Adams, I think there are some errors (no doubt *unintentional*) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion, in regard to the transactions at Ghent, relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties claimed by the United States in the Fisheries, *and to the part which I bore in those transactions.* These important interests are now well secured'—'An account, therefore, of what occurred in the negotiation at Ghent, on those two subjects, is not, perhaps, necessary to the present or future security of any of the rights of the nation, and is *only* interesting as appertaining to its *past* history. With these impressions, and being extremely unwilling to present myself, at any time, before the public, I had almost resolved to remain silent, and thus expose myself to the inference of an acquiescence in the correctness of all the statements made by both my colleagues; but I have on more reflection, thought it may be expected of me, and be considered as a duty on my part, to contribute all in my power towards a full and faithful understanding of the transactions referred to. Under this conviction, I will at some future period, more propitious than the present to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there can be no misinterpretation of motives, lay before the public a narrative of those transactions, as I understood them.'

From even a careless perusal of that letter, it is apparent, that the only two subjects of the negotiations at Ghent to which it refers, were the navigation of the Mississippi and certain fishing liberties; that the errors which I supposed were committed, applied to both Mr. Russell and Mr. Adams, though more particularly to the appendix of the latter; that they were unintentional; that they affected myself principally; that I deemed them of no public importance, as connected with the then, or future security of any of the rights of the nation, but only interesting to its past history; that I doubted the necessity of my offering to the public any account of those transactions; and that the narrative which I promised was to be presented at a season of more calm, and when there could be no misinterpretation of motives. Although Mr. Adams believes otherwise, I yet think there are some unintentional errors, in the controversial papers between him and Mr. Russell.—But I have reserved to myself an exclusive right of judging when I shall execute the promise which I have made, and I shall be neither quickened nor retarded in its performance, by the friendly anxieties of any of my opponents.

If injury accrue to any one by the delay in publishing the narrative, the public will not suffer by it. It is already known by the publication of the British and American projets, the protests, and the correspondence between the respective plenipotentiaries, that the British government made at Ghent a demand of the navigation of the Mississippi, by an article in their projet nearly in the same words as those which were employed in the treaty of 1783; that a majority of the American commissioners was in favour of acceding to that demand, upon the condition that the British government would concede to us the same fishing liberties, within their jurisdiction, as were secured to us by the same treaty of 1783; and that both demands were finally abandoned. The fact of these mutual propositions was communicated by me to the American public in a speech which I delivered in the House of Representatives, on the 29th day of January, 1816. Mr. Hopkinson had arraigned the terms of the treaty of peace, and charged upon the War and the Administration, the loss of the fishing liberties, within the British jurisdiction, which we enjoyed prior to the war. In vindicating, in my reply to him, the course of the government and the conditions of the peace, I stated:—

'When the British Commissioners demanded, in their projet, a renewal to Great Britain of the right of the navigation of the Mississippi, secured by the treaty of 1783, a bare majority of the American commissioners offered to renew it, upon the condition that the liberties in question were renewed to us.—He was not one of that majority. He would not trouble the Committee with his reasons for being opposed to the offer. A majority of his colleagues, *actuated he believed by the best motives*, made, however, the offer, and it was refused by the British Commissioners.'
See Daily Nat. Intel. of the 21st March, 1816.

And what I thought of my colleagues of the majority, appears from the same extract.—The Spring after the termination of the negotiations at Ghent, I went to London, and there entered upon a new and highly important negotiation with two of them, (Messrs. Adams and Gallatin,) which resulted, on the 3d July, 1815, in the Commercial Convention, which has been since made the basis of most of our commercial arrangements with foreign powers. Now, if I had discovered at Ghent, as has been asserted, that either of them was false and faithless to his country, would I have voluntarily commenced with them another negotiation? Further there never has been a period, during our whole acquaintance, that Mr. Adams and I have not exchanged when we have met, friendly salutations, and the courtesies and hospitalities of social intercourse.

The address proceeds to characterize the support which I gave to Mr. Adams as *unnatural*. The authors of the address have not stated why it is unnatural, and we are therefore left to conjecture their meaning. Is it because Mr. Adams is from New England, and I am a citizen of the West? If it be unnatural in the Western States to support a citizen of New England it must be equally unnatural in the New England States to support a citizen of the West. And, on the same principle, the New England States ought to be restrained from concurring in the election of a citizen in the Southern States, or the Southern States from co-operating in the election of a citizen of New England.—And, consequently, the support which the last three Presidents have derived from New England, and that which the Vice President recently received, has been most unnaturally given. The tendency of such reasoning would be to denationalize us, and to contract every part of the Union within the narrow selfish limits of its own section. It would be still worse: it would lead to the destruction of the Union itself. For if it be unnatural in one section to support a citizen in another, the Union itself must be unnatural; all our ties; all our glories; all that is animating in the past; all that is bright and cheering in the future, must be unnatural. Happily, such is the admirable texture of our Union, that the interests of all its parts are closely interwoven. If there are strong points of affinity between the South and the West, there are interests of not less, if not greater, strength and vigour, binding the West, and the North, and the East.

Before I close this address, it is my duty, which I proceed to perform with great regret, on account of the occasion which calls for it, to invite your attention to a letter addressed by Gen. Jackson to Mr. Swartwout, on the 23d February last. The names of both the General and myself had been before the American public, for its highest office. We had both been unsuccessful. The unfortunate have usually some sympathy for each other. For myself, I claim no merit for the cheerful acquiescence which I have given in a result by which I was excluded from the House. I have believed that the decision by the constituted authorities, in favor of others, has been founded upon a conviction of the superiority of their pretensions. It has been my habit, when an election is once decided to forget, as soon as possible, all the irritating circumstances which attended the preceding canvass. If one be successful, he should be content with his success—if he have lost it, railing will do no good. I never gave General Jackson nor his friends any reason to believe that I would, in any contingency, support him. He had, as I thought, no public claim, and I will now add, no personal claims, if these ought to be ever considered, to my support. No one, therefore, ought to have been disappointed or chagrined that I did not vote for him. No more than I was neither surprised nor disappointed, that he did not on a more recent occasion, feel it to be his duty to vote for me. After commenting upon a particular phrase used in my letter to Judge Brooke, a calm consideration of which will, I think, satisfy any person that it was not employed in an offensive sense, if indeed it have an offensive sense, the General, in his letter to Mr. Swartwout, proceeds to remark—"No one beheld me seeking through art or management to entice any representative in Congress from a conscientious responsibility to his own, or the wishes of his constituents. No midnight taper burnt by me—no secret conclaves were held, nor cabals entered into to persuade any one to a violation of pledges given, or of instructions received. By me no plans were concerted to impair the pure principles of our republican institutions, nor to prostrate that fundamental maxim which maintains the supremacy of the people's will. On the contrary, having never in any manner before the people or Congress interfered in the slightest degree with the question, my conscience stands void of offence, and will go quietly with me, regardless of the insinuations of those who, through management may seek an influence not sanctioned by integrity and merit."

I am not aware that this defence of himself was rendered necessary by any charges brought forward against the General. Certainly I never made any such charges against him. I will not suppose that in the passages cited, he intended to impute to me the misconduct which he describes; and yet, taking the whole context of his letter together, and coupling it with Mr. Kremer's address, it cannot be disguised that others may suppose he intended to refer to me. I am quite sure that if he did, he could not have formed those unfavourable opinions of me upon any personal observation of my conduct made by himself; for, a supposition that they were founded upon his own knowledge, would imply that my lodgings and my person had been subjected to a system of espionage wholly incompatible with the open, manly, and honourable conduct of a gallant soldier. If he designed any insinuations against me, I must believe that he made them upon the information of others, of whom I can only say, that they have deceived his credunity, and are entirely unworthy of all credit. I entered into no cabals; I held no secret conclaves; I enticed no man to violate pledges given or instructions received. The members from Ohio and from the other Western States, with whom I voted, were all of them as competent as I was to form an opinion on the pending election. The M'Arthur's and the Metcalf's, and the other gentlemen from the West (some of whom have, if I have not, bravely 'made an effort to repel an invading foe") are as incapable of dishonor as any men breathing; as disinterested, as unambitious, as exclusively devoted to the best interests of their country. It was quite as likely that I should be influenced by them, as that I could control their votes. Our object was not to impair, but to preserve from all danger, the purity of our republican institutions. And how I prostrated the maxim which maintains the supremacy of the people's will, I am entirely at a loss to comprehend. Illusions of the General's imagination deceive him. *The people* of the United States had never decided the election in his favour. If the people had *willed* his election, he would have been elected. It was because they had *not willed* his election, nor that of any other candidate, that the duty of making a choice devolved on the House of Representatives.

The General remarks: "Mr. Clay has never yet risked himself for his country. He has never sacrificed his repose, nor made an effort to repel an invading foe; *of course*, his conscience assured him it was altogether wrong in any other man to lead his countrymen to battle and victory." The logic of this conclusion is not very striking. Gen. Jackson fights better than he reasons. When have I failed to concur in awarding appropriate honours to those who on the sea or on the land have sustained the glory of our arms, if I could not always approve of the acts of some of them? It is true, that it has been my misfortune never to have repelled an invading foe, nor to have led my countrymen to victory. If I had I should have left to others to proclaim and appreciate the deed. The General's destiny and mine have led us in different directions. In the civil employments of my country, to which I have been confined, I regret that the little service which I have been able to render is far short of my wishes. But, why this denunciation of those who have not repelled an invading foe, or led our armies to victory? At the very moment when he is inveighing against an objection to the election to the Presidency, founded upon the exclusive military nature of his merits, does he not perceive that he is establishing its validity by proscribing every man who has not successfully fought the public enemy? And that, by such a general proscription, and the requirement of successful military service as the only condition of civil preferment, the inevitable effect would be the ultimate establishment of a Military Government?

If the contents of the letter to Mr Swartwout were such as justly to excite surprise, there were other circumstances not calculated to diminish it. Of all the citizens of the United States, that gentleman is one of the last to whom it was necessary to address any vindication of Gen. Jackson. He had given abundant evidence of his entire devotion to the cause of the General. He was here after the election, and was one of a committee who invited the General to a public dinner, proposed to be given to him in this place.—My letter to Judge Brooke was published in the papers of this City on the 12th of February. The General's note declining the invitation of Mr. Swartwout and others was published on the 14th in the

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11029-0062.jpg