[*From the Richmond Whig.*]

We present to-day the 2d No. of "A Farmer." It would be an insult to the public taste, farther to press upon it the attentive consideration of those masterly essays. A sage addresses the people of Virginia on their dearest interests—on the prospect before them—on that real and no longer fictitious crisis, that is impending over public affairs—on the best means of saving public liberty—and we trust, for the sake of the Republic, that the people will hear him for his cause, if not for himself.

TO THE PEOPLE OF VIRGINIA.

No. II.

In my first number I endeavored to trace the present disturbed state of society to the effort to place General Jackson in the Presidential chair—to point out the influence of that infirmity of our nature which leads us to pay a blind devotion to military renown—to show from history the fatal effects of such devotion in all the ancient Republics, and to remind you of the last solemn warning of Jefferson, elicited from him by the infatuation of his countrymen in relation to this military chieftain. I shall now proceed to present other views on this interesting subject.

The question forcibly suggests itself, what corresponding benefit, for all the mischief produced by the attempt to elect Jackson, is hoped for, should the attempt succeed? For if no benefit is expected, can there be a greater folly, to say the least, than to disturb the quiet of twelve millions of people for the degrading purpose of paying homage to a successful soldier? The mere name of the man who shall be President, is an insignificant object. The importance of the question, who shall fill the office, consists, not in the name, but in the qualifications of the man, moral and intellectual—in the pledges already given by the individual, that he will faithfully and wisely administer its high functions—and what, in a general view, will be the effect of the election of this or that individual on the interests of the Republic. These are the considerations which every unprejudiced mind should examine before a decision is made.

What benefit, then, to the Republic is expected to result from the election of Jackson? Even some of his active partisans admit, that they support him, not from principle, but from hostility to Mr. Adams. Can there be a doubt that a majority of the American people always have been, and now are, opposed to his election?—and that if he succeed in this second attempt, it will not be because he is deemed worthy of the appointment, but because Adams is thought unworthy? Why is it that so large a portion of the people who acknowledge the unfitness and incompetency of Jackson, still unite in supporting him? Are we, indeed, so destitute of citizens capable of filling the office, that we must submit to the degrading alternative of electing a man so generally admitted to be unqualified? Is there not independence enough among us to free ourselves from the dilemma, or must we tamely submit to the clamorous dictation of a few individuals who arrogantly proclaim that Jackson must be the only competitor to the present incumbent, and who denounce as a traitor or intriguer every citizen who is independent enough to inquire whether we are really reduced so low as to be confined to the choice of two individuals? Whatever may be the reason, it seems to be irrevocably fixed, that the contest is to be between Adams and Jackson.

It becomes, then, the solemn duty of every freeman to compare, or, to speak more correctly, to contrast their respective pretensions to our support.

It may be worth while to fix, in the beginning of this inquiry, what are the proper qualifications for this first office in the gift of man. When these shall be established, it will be an easy matter to measure the respective merits of the candidates. But if we first select the man, and then erect the standard of merit, it will be fashioned from what he is, and not from what he should be.

He who aspires to the Presidency, should possess a character for integrity above suspicion. To a mind well endowed by nature, should be added cultivation to experience in political affairs, which can only be attained by long service in situations favorable to its acquirement. In private and in public life, he should have given proofs of his respect for the laws and constitution of his country—he should have shown himself under various circumstances master of himself, capable of subduing his passions to wholesome restraint, lest in some ungovernable paroxysm, he commit the peace of the nation, or offer violence to the constitution. In fine, it should be well ascertained that he had learned how to govern *himself* before he is entrusted with the government of *others*.

Is there a reflecting man in the community who will deny that these are indispensable qualifications in a candidate for the Presidency? Before we hurry away to a decision, then let us inquire which of the individuals, to whom our choice is confined, approaches nearest to this standard. In private life, a prudent man would not need advice to inquire into the qualifications of one whom he was about to employ in the management of his affairs. He would look for an agent among those whose experience and capacity were suited to the duties to be performed. He would take care to select the best he could obtain. Is it not a species of treason against liberty itself, to be less solicitous about the selection of a properly qualified citizen to fill the Presidency, where, on his fitness essentially depend the best interest of this great Republic? Let us then, try the two candidates by the standard agreed upon.

To begin with Mr. Adams:—His character for integrity, and all the moral qualities has never been arraigned even by the bitterness of party. His worst enemies have not denied to him an intellect of the highest order, with an experience, the result of more than thirty years employment in the public service, in situations the most favorably for acquiring it, to which he was honorably called by Washington, and every succeeding President:—Cool and deliberate, no instance has occurred, either in his private or public life, of his committing an infraction on the law: he has been guilty of no insolent defiance of the instructions of his superiors. Having learned to govern himself, he may be safely entrusted with the government of others.

How will General Jackson abide a comparison with this character? I wish to speak of him, not only without malice, but with all due respect. Were it not for his pretension to an office, for which neither nature nor education designed him, and his election to which—however some others may have changed their opinions in that regard—I still think would be "a curse to his country," I would gladly assist in holding the veil over his defects. But having undertaken to present a correct view to my fellow-citizens of the existing state of affairs, I must perform the task, however painful. In doing so however, I shall not go one step beyond the necessity of the occasion to seek out the foibles and offences of Gen: Jackson. I shall forbear to peep into the discussion of topics which belong rather to a moral than to a political tribunal, being unwilling to inflict pain by unpleasant references, unless they are imperiously demanded by considerations of public interest.

Here then, is the portrait of General Jackson. Without education, without experience in political affairs, utterly ignorant of our international concerns, the regulation of which is the most prominent duty of the President, destitute of knowledge in the rights of individuals or of the States, as guaranteed by the Constitution; and continually liable to the influence of the most turbulent passions, which, when roused, and they are easily roused, betray him into the most unwarrantable excesses. Is this picture too highly colored? Let us look at a few of the incidents of his life. I seek not to mangle—I am only executing justice; the smallest enumeration, therefore, that can answer the purposes of justice, shall suffice.

His assault upon Col. Benton, with design to assassination, as detailed in Benton's appeal to the public in 1813, which is yet uncontradicted, must satisfy every man that a more outrageous act was never committed in civilized society. Suppose, fellow-citizens, the same punishment had been awarded to Jackson that would have been awarded to more humble citizens, where now would be this candidate for the Presidency? If he escaped the penalties of the law from his power or influence, will you not only excuse him, but deem him worthy of an office, designed in its creation for the best and wisest of mankind? But some of you may say, we have nothing to do with his private character let it be as irregular or as violent as it may: It is his public character which claims the meed of praise. To THAT, then let us refer. What man, having a respect for the rights and dignity of a State, can read without indignation, his insolent letter to Gov. Rabun—his treatment of the Legislature of Louisiana, whose hall was surrounded by his troops, to the exclusion of the members—his arrest of the Governor, with a file of soldiery, who ignominiously dragged him along the streets of his own capital as a prisoner, while the tyrant threatened before the assembled multitude to hang him to "yon tree," if he again incurred his displeasure. This is the man now held up as the champion of *State Rights!* But let us proceed. The sedition law, though ratified by the whole authority of the Government, deservedly called down the vengeance of an indignant people on its authors; yet the proclamation of Gen. Jackson, infinitely more severe against the liberty of the press, is appealed to by his friends as a matter of commendation—*nothing shall be published but what he approves!* He banishes, by similar order, a whole class of citizens: the press presumes to question its legality—the offender, a member of the legislature, who had previously fought by his side in all his battles, is arrested and imprisoned, at a time, too, long after he himself had announced that the enemy had fled the country, *broken* and *destroyed*. A judge of the federal court is applied to for a *habeas corpus* under oath—he issues it, as was his bounden duty; but the successful cheftain, far from yielding obedience to this mandate of the civil authority, arrests and imprisons the judge. The attorney of the United States, for endeavoring to vindicate the majesty of the law, shares the same fate. He does not *hang* them, it is true—but he banishes the judge, and places the other offenders under military *surveillance*. And when, finally, on the restoration of peace, he is called to account for some of these violations of the law, and the constitution, his friends proclaim him a paragon of excellence, because he did not let his partisans commit violence on the court taking cognizance of his outrages!

The enumeration of Jackson's improper public acts, is as painful as it is tedious. I shall content myself with adverting to a few of the most prominent. In time of profound peace, he expressly directs his subalterns to disregard any order, even from the President himself, without his sanction. He violated his positive orders in invading a neutral country, and thereby substantially exercised the high power of making war, which must enevitably have ensued but for the weakness and pusillanimity of the insulted power. He acted the Dictator in putting to death Arbuthnot and Ambrister, and evinced an innate thirst for blood in hanging an Indian who had fallen into his hands by stratagem—justifying this bloody procedure by avowing that the only mode of *civilizing* these unfortunate people was to *exterminate* them! He caused two hundred of the militia men of his own State to be ignominiously punished, six of them with *death*, against the positive law of the land, and under circumstances shocking to humanity. He decreed eight of the regular army to be shot in a manner little less calculated than the fate of the militiamen to excite our pity for the victims and horror towards their executioner. He finally threatened to enter into the chamber of the National Senate, and cut off the ears of the members, for presuming to inquire into those things; and was prevented from carrying his threat into execution only by the stern patriotism and courage of Decatur.

These are facts which even the Nashville Committee have not denied; nor can they deny them. Read, then, and decide whether I have set down aught in malice, in attempting to delineate the unfitness of Jackson for the Presidency.—Say also whether our Jefferson did him injustice, when he declared he had disregarded every order, and substituted his own ungovernable will for the law and the constitution. On the contrary, was he not well justified in the expression of his fears, almost in his dying hour, that the support of such a man for the Presidency indicated an incapacity in man for self government? When you have maturely reflected on these views, you will be able to answer the question, which of the citizens in nomination best deserves your support. A FARMER.

From the Salem Register, Sept. 20.

CHARLES CARROLL OF CARROLLTON. Was born at Annapolis, Maryland, on the 20th of Sept. 1737—ninety years ago this day. In 1745, then eight years old, he was taken to the College of English Jesuits, at St. Omers, to be educated. Here he remained for six years, and left it to pursue his studies at a College of French Jesuits, at Rheims. After staying one year at Rheims, he was sent to the College of Louis Le Grand. After two years he went to Bourges to study the civil law, and after remaining there one year, returned to College, at Paris, where he continued two years, when he went to London, and took apartments, and commenced the study of the law in the temple. He returned to America in 1764. In June 1768, he was married to Mary Darnell. He soon took a part in defence of the Colonies against the claims of the mother country, with his pen. In 1770 and '71 he wrote several articles under the signature of "The First Citizen," against the right of the Governor to regulate fees by proclamation, which gained him the applause and thanks of his fellow-citizens. In 1771 or '72 in conversation with Judge Chase, the latter remarked, 'Carroll, we have the better of our opponents—we have completely written them down.'—'And do you think,' Carroll replied,' that writing will settle the question between us?' 'To be sure,' replied Chase, 'what else can we resort to?' 'The bayonet,' was the answer. 'Our arguments will only raise the feelings of the people to that pitch, when open war will be looked to as the arbiter of the dispute.'

Some years before the commencement of hostilities, Mr. Graves member of Parliament, and brother, of the Admiral, wrote to Mr. Carroll on the subject of our difficulties, ridiculed the idea of our resistance, and said that six thousand English troops would march from one end of the continent to the other. 'So they may, said Carroll in his reply, 'but they will be masters of the spot only on which they encamp. They will find nought but enemies before them. If we are beaten on the plains, we will retreat to our mountains, and defy them. Our resources will increase with our difficulties. Necessity will force us to exertion; until, tired of combatting, in vain against a spirit which victory after victory cannot subdue, your armies will evacuate our soil, and your country retire an immense loser, from the contest. No, sir, we have made up our minds to abide the issue of the approaching struggle; and though much blood may be spilt, we have no doubt of our ultimate success.'

When the tea was imported into Annapolis, great excitement prevailed, and, Mr. Stewart, the owner, was threatened with personal violence—his friends called on Mr. Carroll to use his influence to protect him—Mr. Carroll said to them, it will not do gentlemen; to export the tea to Europe or the West Indies. Its importation, contrary to the known regulations of the Convention, is an offence for which the people will not be so easily satisfied; and whatever may be my personal esteem for Mr. Stewart, and my wish to prevent violence, it will not be in my power to protect him, unless he consents to pursue a more decisive course of conduct. My advice is, that he set fire to the vessel and burn her, together with the tea she contains, to the water's edge." Mr. Stewart then appeared and assented to the proposition, and in a few hours the brigantine Peggy, with her sails set and her colors flying, was enveloped in flames, and the immense crowd then collected, perfectly satisfied. In 1775 he was chosen a member of the first Committee of Observation, that was established at Annapolis; and the same year he was elected a delegate to the Provincial Convention. In February 1776, he was appointed a commissioner with Dr. Franklin and Judge Chase, to proceed to Canada and induce the inhabitants of that country, to unite with us. His brother the venerable Catholic Archbishop, accompanied them on this important service. He returned from Canada in June, 1776, and on the 12th presented their report. He found the Declaration of Independence under discussion and the delegates of his state shackled by instructions, (given the December previous, and against which he had then contended) 'to disavow in the most solemn manner, all design in the Colonies of Independence.' On his return he hastened to Annapolis, to resume his seat and procure, if possible, a withdrawal of these instructions. He and Judge Chase labored with so much success, that on the 28th of June the instructions were withdrawn and the delegates authorized to join in a Declaration of Independence.

On the fourth of July, 1776, he was appointed a delegate to Congress, and on the second of August, when this instrument was first signed, he was one of the earliest signers. No one was more willing to sign, and when he subscribed, a member standing by said, "There go a few millions."—No one risqued more property, if so much, as Mr. Carroll, as he was probably the richest man in the United States. Mr. Carroll took his seat on the 18th of July, and was soon placed on the board of War. In the latter part of 1776 he was one of the committee to draft the constitution of Maryland. In December, 1776, he was chosen to the Senate under the constitution of that State.—In 1777 he was re-appointed a delegate to Congress. In 1781 and in 1786 he was re-elected to the Senate of Maryland, and in 1783 a Senator to the United States—In 1797 he was again elected to the Senate of Maryland, and in 1799 was appointed one of the commissioners to settle the boundary line between Virginia and Maryland. Mr. Carroll's grandfather emigrated from Ireland, and in 1825 his granddaughter was married to the Marquis of Wellesley, then Viceroy of Ireland. And it is a singular circumstance, that one hundred & forty years after the first emigration of her ancestors to America this lady should become Vice-Queen of the country from which they fled, at the summit of a system, which a more immediate ancestor had risked every thing to destroy; or, in the energetic and poetical language of the bishop of England, "that in the land from which his father's father fled in fear, his daughter's daughter now reigns a queen."

We subjoin the following letter of the President, then Secretary of State, which has never been published in any newspaper, (we believe) showing that the Declaration of Independence was signed not on the 4th of July, as is generally supposed, but on the 2d of August subsequent:

'TO CHARLES CARROLL, of Carrollton.

Department of State, }
WASHINGTON, 24th June, 1824. }

Sir—In pursuance of a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, a copy of which is hereto annexed, and by direction of the President of the U. States, I have the honour of transmitting to you two *fac similie* copies of the original Declaration of Independence, engrossed on parchment, conformably to a secret resolution of Congress of 19th July, 1776, to be signed by every member of Congress, and accordingly signed on the second day of August, of the same year. Of this document, unparalleled in the annals of mankind, the original, deposited in this department, exhibits your name as one of the subscribers. The rolls herewith transmitted are copies as exact as the art of engraving can present, of the instrument itself, as well as of the signers to it.

'While performing the duty thus assigned me, permit me to felicitate you, and the country which is reaping the reward of your labours, as well that your hand was affixed to this record of glory, as that, after the lapse of near half a century, you survive to receive this tribute of reverence and gratitude, from your children, the present fathers of the land.

'With every sentiment of veneration, I have the honour of subscribing myself your fellow citizen,

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

'Doughoregan Manor,
Sept. 15th, 1826.

From the Albany Daily Advertiser

In looking over the files of the Albany Gazette, printed in the year 1786, I observed the following enumeration of dwelling houses, estimate of inhabitants, &c. in fifteen of the then principal cities and towns of the United States, I send it to you as matter of curiosity for insertion in your daily paper. The five principal cities, viz: New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore and Charleston, at that period, did not contain more than about three fifths of the present number of inhabitants in the city of New York.

Number of houses in the several cities & towns mentioned below, taken from actual enumeration.

Philadelphia, 4,600—New York, 3,500—Boston, 2,100—Baltimore, 1,900—Charleston, 1,530—Albany, 550—New Haven, 400—Hartford, 300—Wilmington Del. 400—Annapolis, 260—Fredericktown Md. 400—Alexandria, Va. 300—Richmond Va. 280—Petersburg, Va. 200—Williamsburgh, Va, 250.

Boston by an accurate calculation lately made has been found to contain 14,640 inhabitants, exclusive of strangers. This number gives seven persons to a house. If the same proportion holds in the other towns of America, it will be easy to determine the number of fixed inhabitants in Philadelphia N: York &c. Multiplying the number of houses by 7 there must be exclusive of strangers, in Philadelphia, 32,205—N. York, 24,500—Baltimore 13,300—Charleston, 10,700. The number of strangers in either of these towns cannot readily be ascertained. New York, being the seat of government, probably contains more than Boston; allowing however, eight persons to a house including strangers, which, perhaps, is a supposition near the truth, there are in Philadelphia 36,000—New York 28,000—Boston, 16,000—Baltimore, 15,000—Charleston, 12,350 inhabitants—

Albany, Gazette, Sept. 28, 1786.

MAGISTRATES' BLANKS
FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE

For the Easton Gazette.

TO THE PEOPLE OF TALBOT COUNTY.

A publication in the last Star signed 'Thunder,' having implicated me in an unfounded charge, I deem it my duty to appear before the public, and vindicate myself from the foul aspersion. I have been accused of being 'nominated by the Adams Junto,' and of being engaged 'in an unhallowed conspiracy *against*, and in open denunciation *of* all the other candidates,' except those with whom my name has been associated. For myself I again declare to you, my fellow citizens, in truth and sincerity of heart (as we who are named together have already stated in a hand bill now before the public,) that the accusation is entirely destitute of foundation, and that I have had no participation in any caucus, or in any association for the purpose of forming an Adams ticket, to the exclusion of other honorable candidates. For it is well known that there are other Adams candidates before the people besides those who are named in the piece signed 'Thunder,' and I should have disdained to have uttered or published any thing calculated to wound their sensibility.

The publication in the last Gazette, signed 'A Talbot Voter,' is, I presume, simply the expression of the opinion of a private individual, the author of which is unknown to me. I have understood that I have been accused of writing the piece last named, & of having used expressions at a meeting of the people in the Bay Side District, similar to those contained in the same. I pronounce the accusations to be both false & invidious, and assert, that language has been attributed to me which I never used, and sentiments which I never uttered. For they are directly opposite to those that I have always maintained both in public and in private—before friends & foes and are such as I entirely disavow and deny. In regard to the important question that now divides and agitates our country, I feel in common with you all a deep and lively interest. Born and educated in a land of liberty, where opinions are as free and unconfined as the air we breathe, I have an undoubted right to the exercise of this glorious privilege. And although I am friendly to the present Administration both of the State and General Government, yet I am not the exclusive partizan of any party, but shall, in my political capacity, pursue that plan of policy which I think most conducive to the happiness and interest of my native state.—Should I receive a majority of your suffrages, and be delegated to represent you in our next Legislature, it is my intention to vote for such and such only, whom I think the best qualified for the station, without regard to their attachment either to the Jackson or the Adams party.

Such is the mutability of all human opinion, that I find myself, in the space of a few short years, opposed in sentiments to those with whom I have often taken council, and with whom I have always acted in concert. And shall I for that reason, denounce those friends? May Heaven forbid, that the bitter emotions of party strife should ever again exert their baneful influence over the hearts of happy and highly favoured Americans.

I am well convinced that the piece signed 'A Talbot Voter' will have an injurious effect upon my election, and I very much regret that any such has appeared before the public. In reference to the candidates who are in favour of General Jackson, I hold them in high estimation, and do not think them less friendly to their country, for their predilection in favour of the man of their choice. He is undoubtedly entitled to much honor and applause from all his countrymen, but I think Mr. Adams more eminently qualified for that distinguished station, and consequently shall give my vote for his re-election.

With these remarks I submit to the will of an enlightened people, and shall cheerfully acquiesce in their decision on Monday next.

THOMAS MARTIN.

Talbot county, Sept. 27th, 1827.

LONDON, Aug. 9.

A curious circumstance occurred at Elstree Herts, a few days ago. A fine little child, about two years and a half old, was missed by its father, who is gardener in a gentleman's family. Concluding that the child had fallen into one of the ponds in the garden, they were dragged but nothing found which could lead to a discovery.—The out houses, in fact the neighbourhood was searched with as little success. In the evening a boy was passing the dog kennel to which was chained a large Newfoundland dog, and which unlikely place no one had ventured near, espied the little infant fast asleep in the humble dwelling of his canine friend. The paws of the animal were around the child's neck, On his attempting to approach the child, the dog showed symptoms of a determination to retain possession of his little companion, which induced the boy to call the father of the child to aid in his rescue. He also was denied to approach; but the infant, being awoke was immediately permitted to leave the kennel, to run to the arms of its overjoyed parent.

QUEER ACCIDENT.

The Stonnington Telegraph contains an account of a novel and singular occurrence.—Those who know any thing of the nature and habits of sheep, are aware of the singular tenacity with which they follow each other.—Wherever one sheep goes, the rest are sure to follow. The other day one of them took it into his head to jump into a corn field; the others, sheep like, followed, and they were all found up to their backs in mischief. On starting them from the field, they chose to jump over a wall, on the side of which was a deep well. The first one leaped the wall, and brought up at the bottom of the well; and the remainder of the flock followed of course, till eighteen of them were snugly stowed away in the bottom of the well. With much difficulty, they were taken out; though not till eight of them were drowned.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11029-0575.jpg