

Political.

More Documents.—A pressure of other important matter has prevented us until now, from noticing the "Reply of the Jackson Corresponding Committee of the District of Columbia, to Mr. Clay's last Address," which has recently appeared in several newspapers, and also in pamphlet form. Our limits will not permit an insertion of the unbroken chain of evidence adduced by the Committee, exhibiting in their language, "an array of testimony which goes to establish, beyond the possibility of a rational doubt, the charge of a corrupt political bargain between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay." The following are the principal points of the testimony:

In the first place, the Committee show conclusively, that the political differences of Messrs. Adams and Clay were of long standing—as Mr. Adams said in his reply to Mr. Clay's letter relative to the occurrences at Ghent, "that from the seed time of 1814, to the harvest of 1822," they were politically opposed to each other; and that their hostility from the latter period was open and avowed, until the fall of 1824, when it began to be doubtful whether Mr. Clay would be among those returned to the House of Representatives. So far did Mr. Clay's hostility extend, that late in the fall of 1823, he paid \$100, towards printing a pamphlet, severely censuring the political opinions, character and conduct of Mr. Adams, the manuscript of which passed through Mr. Clay's hands, if he was not actually the author, as was fully substantiated in the recent investigation before the Legislature of Kentucky.

The Committee next show, that the personal differences between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Clay were reconciled in the winter of 1823-4, and that their "friendly intercourse" continued until within a few days of the Presidential election—which is in fact admitted by Mr. Clay, in his pamphlet.

To rebut the testimony produced by Mr. Clay, relative to having made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson, for months previous to depositing his vote in the ballot box, the Committee introduce the testimony of Mr. Carneal, of the Senate of Kentucky, the Hon. C. A. Wickliffe and T. P. Moore, of the Kentucky Delegation, and the Hon. J. Floyd, of Virginia, to all of whom Mr. Clay declared himself undecided, some time subsequent to his other declarations—in the month of January, 1825, or the latter part of the preceding month, Mr. Clay said to Mr. Floyd, "When I take up the pretensions of Mr. Adams, and weigh them and lay them down—then take up the pretensions of Gen. Jackson, weigh them, and lay them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams—I never was so much puzzled in all my life as I am to decide between them." The testimony of these gentlemen is sustained by Mr. Clay's conduct at the period alluded to, and by his speeches, letters, &c. and directly convicts him of holding one language to his confidential friends and another to the public.

To show the motives which governed the friends of Mr. Clay in the Presidential election, the Committee introduce the testimony of several individuals, given before the Legislature of Kentucky, and the affidavits of numerous respectable citizens of Kentucky, stating the reasons publicly assigned by several of the Delegation who with Mr. Clay gave the vote of Kentucky to Mr. Adams—Mr. White said, "he voted for Mr. Clay and not for Mr. Adams"—Mr. Johnson said, "he voted for Mr. Adams, to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State"—Mr. Metcalfe said, "we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the Cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams"—Mr. Trimble said, "we distinctly ascertained that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and that Gen. Jackson would not." These gentlemen have never publicly denied having made these declarations, but think to justify themselves by asserting that they knew of no propositions having been made by Mr. Clay to either of the parties—and

Mr. Clay appears to think that this evasion will satisfy the people! The following statement perhaps accounts for the declaration of Mr. Clay's friends: and justifies the inference that the negotiation was carried on personally between Messrs. Adams and Clay:—the Hon. John McLane, Senator from Illinois, says, "the Kentucky Delegation who voted for Mr. Adams, had a meeting to determine upon their course, as I was informed by one of them, at which, it was said to me, that upon the question being proposed to Mr. Clay, for whom shall we vote? he answered, in substance, 'that in case General Jackson should be elected, he believed that the administration, with its weight, would be opposed to him to prostrate him; that, should Mr. Adams be elected, he felt satisfied it would not be so, but that he hoped no personal consideration for him, would induce them to act contrary to their desire.'"

If this array of testimony is suffered to pass uncontroverted, can any person doubt, when added to the statements of Messrs. Buchanan and Markley, but that Mr. Clay and his friends voted for Mr. Adams because they "distinctly ascertained that Mr. Adams would make a bargain, and that Gen. Jackson would not?"

The following extracts from letters published by the Committee, throw some additional light on the last Presidential Election—in connexion with the indirect acknowledgment of Mr. Walsh, that several Federal members, through Mr. Webster, ascertained from Mr. Adams how the loaves and fishes were to be distributed "before they definitively resolved to vote for him," they afford a clue to the means resorted to by Messrs. Adams and Clay to procure for themselves the two first offices in the government in defiance of the wishes of the people. It will be recollected that the vote of Mr. Brent decided that of Louisiana—that Messrs. Scott of Missouri, and Cook of Illinois, personally held the votes of these States in their hands—and that the votes of two other States were "definitively" given by a few federal members, through Mr. Webster's instrumentality, to Mr. Adams, making five out of the thirteen votes which elected him; the three first of whom had previously declared their determination to vote for Gen. Jackson.

The Hon. R. K. Call, Delegate from Florida, in a letter to the Chairman of the Committee, says:

"Before I conclude, permit me to mention a conversation which I had with Mr. Brent, of Louisiana. This gentleman, between whom and myself there had been no particular intimacy, gave me the first intelligence I received of the vote of Louisiana. He sought the interview, and after communicating the fact, remarked, that Mr. Clay was out of the question. I observed to him, your State appears to be in favor of Gen. Jackson: what will be the vote of her Delegation when the question comes before the House? He replied, '*vox populi vox Dei*,' is my motto. A few days after, in enumerating the States which would probably vote for Gen. Jackson, Mr. Brent mentioned Louisiana. Soon, however, after this, he became more distant, and we did not converse on the Presidential question again, until a few moments after the balloting, which resulted in the election of Mr. Adams. I then met Mr. Brent and observed to him, Sir, *vox populi* is not *vox Dei*! The gentleman understood my allusion, and replied, that he had no instructions from his district, and that he had been left in the dark with regard to the wishes of the people. I told him, that I wished only to remind him, that *vox populi* was not always *vox Dei*, and we sepa-

rated. I mention this circumstance as an evidence of the correctness of the information I had received of the views and determination of Mr. Clay. That he did hold the election in his own hands, is proved by the result. That he is in the Cabinet is equally clear; and that Mr. Brent was instrumental in placing him there, none will doubt. By what magical artifice he seduced the worthy representative of Louisiana from his allegiance and his motto, he best can tell."

Mr. O. B. Brown, in a letter to the Hon. J. H. Eaton, relative to a conversation held with the Hon. J. Scott, of Missouri, ten days before the inauguration of Mr. Adams, states as follows—it will be recollected that Messrs. Scott and Cook were both dismissed by their constituents, the first receiving the appointment of Inspector of Land Offices, with a salary of \$3000 per annum, from President Adams; the latter employed as a *secret agent* to Cuba—Mr. Brown observes:

"I asked him (Mr. Scott) if his vote would be popular in Missouri? He answered, that nineteen-twentieths of his constituents would be opposed to it. I then inquired of him what would be said of him when he returned home? He replied that his vote would make a great noise for a time; but that their election was over, and they could not touch him under two years, and in that time the excitement would probably subside. He added, that it was ascertained if Mr. Adams should not be elected on the first ballot, he could not be elected afterwards; that if he had not voted for him, Mr. Cook, of Illinois, would not have voted for him, and that without both of their votes, he would not have been elected. I then remarked, that as the election had depended upon him, I supposed, in case of his own failure at the next election, he would be otherwise provided for. To this he answered, that he would accept of no appointment whatever under the administration of Mr. Adams, lest it should be regarded as the reward of his vote. I asked him how he could then expect Mr. Clay to accept the appointment of Secretary of State, as it was rumored it was to be tendered to him, in case of Mr. Adams' election, and I supposed it would be expected that Mr. Clay would accept it. He remarked, that Mr. Clay did not act for himself, but for the West. That Mr. Clay was the man of the West. 'We,' said he, (alluding, as I supposed to the western members who voted for Mr. Adams,) 'act for the West, and Mr. Clay is our man. He must not consider himself as Mr. Clay, but as the West, and in that character it will be his duty to accept.'"

Clay in Virginia.—When the Secretary of State was travelling in Virginia, some time since, he stopped at a country tavern, and while his horses were feeding, engaged in conversation with the landlord, to whom he was unknown. After some general observations on political events and prospects, the Premier enquired—"What do the people in your neighborhood think of the present administration?" The answer was—"I don't know exactly what they

think of the administration, but if you mean Adams and Clay, we all think them two of the greatest knaves in the country."—Noah.

Communications.

FOR THE FREE PRESS.

To the *Freemen of the State of North-Carolina.*

Fellow-citizens: the time is not far distant when you will be called upon to select men to represent you in the next General Assembly of your State, and in my humble opinion the present situation of a number of the good people of this State never needed Legislative interference more than at present. It is discovered that a number of the judgments recently obtained in our Courts of Law, are marked to be paid in specie or its equivalent, which is certainly contrary to the expectation of the parties when those contracts were made; thereby increasing the embarrassed condition of our citizens, by compelling them to make great sacrifices to meet those unexpected demands; and this is in a great degree practised by the note shavers and northern traders who have come among us—and under the existing law they have the privilege of demanding specie even on the day when they expose your property for sale, without giving you previous notice, thereby allowing you no opportunity to prepare to meet this unexpected demand. Fellow-citizens, doth it appear safe to risk the property of the good people of this State to the clemency of a few avaricious speculators and traders? (judge ye.) Far be it from me to request the Legislators of our State to pass a law that would violate the Constitution, or impair the obligation of contracts; but that they can pass a law that will in a great degree put a stop to this ungenerous, (and if I may use the expression,) inhuman practice, without infringing on either, I feel confident. To exemplify this, I will cite you an act of the Legislature of Kentucky some years past, which perhaps has been the means of saving that State from ruin; (it is in substance as follows:) that whenever a plaintiff intends demanding specie or its equivalent, or any other funds save the money of the State in discharge of his or her debt, he or she shall enter the plea on trial, or shall be barred the privilege—but, whenever any plaintiff shall enter such plea as aforesaid, then the defendant shall have a stay of execution for the term of two years, by giving sufficient security for such stay, the debt bearing six per cent. interest until paid—this stay of execution is granted to give the defendant an opportunity to procure funds to meet this unexpected demand, and doth not interfere with contracts whose engagements are made to be paid in specie, nor with any Bank or Incorporated Company who have by their charters made similar engagements. Perhaps objections may be made against this long stay of execution as being unconstitutional; but surely, if a Legis-