

the case with thoughtless young men, has mistaken the date of McCarty's letter, and that instead of the 1st of June it ought to appear to be dated the 1st of October. I wish to take no advantage of his thoughtlessness; but yet, in some unguarded moment, he might blunder upon a worse vote in Congress, (should he be elected,) than he pretends to think. I gave, in the case of Penelope Denny. However, to be serious, (if this matter deserves seriousness,) it does appear that I must have written General Noble's letter of recommendation, at least several days after I had written for McCarty; yet Mr. Smith boldly ventures to say, in defiance of truth and his own evidence, "that I pretended to be recommending McCarty specially, while at the same time, I had previously recommended Gen. Noble in much stronger terms." So much for his candor in this respect. He is equally uncandid in saying that Gen. Noble was understood to be a candidate for Congress, and that I recommended him thus highly to get him out of my way; and the letter to Judge Mount will give the lie to his assertions, unless he will contend that I wanted to get him out of my way likewise.

The following is a copy of my letter to Judge Mount.

"Brookville, October 8, 1825.
"Sir,—You have no doubt been informed of the death of Mr. Lazarus Noble, the receiver of the land office at this place. My friend David Mount, is an applicant to fill the place rendered vacant by his death. Judge Mount has long been a resident of this country, and has filled during the time, some very important public stations, is a gentleman of unsullied character, well acquainted with business, and every way qualified, to discharge the duties of the office to which he aspires; and should the appointment be conferred upon him, I am persuaded, it would meet the universal approval of the people in this quarter. I can further say that if good moral character, strict integrity, and honesty in public and private life, give claim to public favor, no man has higher claims than the Judge."

It will be seen, I think, that the above letter, is in as strong terms, as Gen. Noble's. I likewise gave one to Mr. Ross Smiley of Union county, in pretty much the same terms; a copy of which, I have not.

Mr. Smith says he had publicly made the above charge on me, in several places through the district; now I can assure Mr. Smith, I never made a charge against him since he became my competitor for the seat in Congress, except, such as were involved in, and absolutely connected with my defence of his numberless little filthy charges against me. I never was guilty of such meanness; and I can assure Mr. Smith, that such a course, would so injure a man's character and standing in the councils of the nation, as to render him almost useless to his constituents; for such things are generally as well known at the capital of the Union as at home, where they transpired. Again, Mr. Smith pays the people of Brookville, a very poor compliment unless he can make it appear, they are all unfriendly to me; for he says, my bad conduct was no secret in the town; now, if Mr. Smith tells the truth, every man in Brookville must have known that I had acted basely towards McCarty; and yet, strange as it may appear, I believe I can safely say, almost every citizen in the town (the McCarty's excepted) is my friend; and can further say to Mr. Smith that the citizens of Brookville have as high claims to respectability as he, or any of the firm; and who would not wink at baseness sooner than they. Mr. Smith has produced a strange kind of paradox, wherein by proving too little, he proves too much; because he affirms, that my conduct towards the McCarty's was no secret in Brookville to any one; yet, in fact, the people of the town are friendly to me; it follows of course, that where my conduct is best known, it is most approved, and, therefore, must have been correct. Again, Mr. Smith proves that the people of this district, generally, believe him not entitled to credit when he speaks, for he says, he had made his charge against me through the district; and, that the people had thought it false and intended to injure me. Now if the fact exists, the case stands thus, Mr. Smith voluntarily trumps a tale, which every body thinks false, and then turns about to scalp me, because the people will not believe him. So much for Mr. Smith's candor in this respect.

Let us now examine the course the Company have thought proper to take. It will be found, that there is not only the "integro" and the "intregee" but the "operator" and the "operated." Abner McCarty operates upon Enoch, and Enoch upon Smith, who becomes their Don Quixote, (not to operate upon a windmill) but upon me. I am to fall a victim to their joint operations: I was not disposed to join their holy alliance; I must therefore, be immolated. Here let me observe, that as the whole company have embarked in the same ship, they will be carried quietly along with the same breeze, or driven furiously by the same storm, & engulfed in the same vortex; they cannot be separated. As they have all of them, (Smith not excepted,) by a combination and joint effort, endeavored to injure me, I shall feel myself at liberty to use the aid of any one of them in my defence. If, therefore, I can make it appear, that any of them has asserted a falsehood, I shall consider it as applying to the whole company. Let us then examine E. McCarty's statement first, and if he does not place himself in the predicament of the two Thieves who stole the meat. I think I shall convict him of a falsehood; and if I convict him of one falsehood, I shall claim to have his evidence set aside altogether. He holds out the idea in his statement to Smith, that he did not know I had recommended Gen. Noble until after I had left this place for Washington. Yet Gen. Noble declares that after obtaining my letter of recommendation, he informed Abner McCarty

on the same day that he got it. Enoch says, I promised to do as much for Abner as Mr. Jennings did. I presume he means by that, I promised to recommend him only; because if he had insisted upon me doing the same thing that Mr. Jennings did, I must have written a second letter to defeat the first; for it is evident, by Mr. Jennings' letter, written to Mr. Rush, that Enoch, or Abner, or both of them, asserted an unqualified falsehood, or that Mr. Jennings has; and I am not willing to believe that Mr. Jennings would do so under any circumstances, and more especially, when writing to one of the departments of Government. Let us see how the two statements stand. Enoch McCarty says, I promised to do as much for Abner as Mr. Jennings would; of course I could not tell what to do for him, unless I saw what Mr. Jennings would do; and yet, Mr. Jennings in his letter to Mr. Rush, dated "Oct. 5th, 1825, says, representations have been made to him, that Judge Test, a Representative from this state, had written a very pressing letter to the department over which Mr. Rush presided, or to the president of the United States, in favor of Mr. Abner McCarty for the office of Receiver in the Brookville land district, and the Hon. William Hendricks, Senator from Indiana, would also write in favor of Mr. McCarty. If such representations be incorrect, or shall be found incorrect from the letters received by the government, I would respectfully suggest the propriety of authorizing Robert Hanna, Esq. (of Indianapolis, to which place the land office has lately been removed) who is the Register, to employ some person to transact the business of Receiver until time be afforded to enable a more satisfactory appointment, than perhaps can be made under such circumstances as will be arising, if the representations alluded to, shall be found incorrect." In this letter, Mr. Jennings tells Mr. Rush the secretary of the treasury, "that representations had been made to him, that I had written (not that I would write) a very pressing letter in favor of Mr. McCarty." Now it will appear evident from Mr. McCarty's statement to Smith, that whoever made these representations to Mr. Jennings, told a downright falsehood; for I declare, I have written no letter in favor of Abner, and Enoch admits the fact, by saying, "I was to do as much for Abner as Mr. Jennings would"—of course I must see what Mr. Jennings would do, before I could know how much I had to do, or what I had to write for Abner. The next question is, who made these false representations to Mr. Jennings? (for they are false): It is evident, it must have been Enoch or Abner, or both of them, because, it seems they were made at the time he wrote the letter for Abner, and were the cause of his writing that letter; he says, it was represented I had written, and Mr. Hendricks was to write, hence it was before Mr. Hendricks wrote; and if I mistake not, Mr. Hendricks' letter in favor of Abner is dated the same day, or the day following Mr. Jennings'. Now, it is not likely, Mr. McCarty took a stranger with him to tell a lie for him to Mr. Jennings, and if not, he must have made these false representations himself; and as is not unlikely, carried a letter from his brother Enoch to Mr. Jennings, which likewise contained them. That Mr. Jennings intends to fix it upon Enoch or Abner, is very evident; for he tells Mr. Rush, "if those representations should turn out to be incorrect he wished him to authorize General Hanna, to employ some one to do the business of Receiver until a more satisfactory appointment could be made," thereby, clearly intending to impress upon the mind of the Secretary of the Treasury, that Abner, or some of the family, had made these representations; that he was fearful, they were false; and if so, he had better wait until a more satisfactory appointment could be made than Abner's—saying in substance, that he suspected him for telling a falsehood; that if it were so in fact, the appointment of such a man would be very unsatisfactory to the government. As to the falsehood of the representations alluded to by Mr. Jennings, a solitary doubt cannot for a moment be now entertained, for I never had written such a letter as he speaks of, either pressing or otherwise; and E. McCarty's statement to Smith admits the fact. I shall leave the people to decide, which tells the falsehood Mr. Jennings or the McCarty's. I am very sorry that I am compelled to believe that either of them would do so: I am, however, compelled to suggest, that it might be very convenient for the McCarty's to inform Mr. Jennings, that I had written a very pressing letter for Abner, as an inducement for him to do the same; and at the same time, back the proposition, with the assertion, that Mr. Hendricks had promised to do so likewise; and if they would represent to Mr. Jennings, that I had written a pressing letter for Abner, when in fact I had not, it would not be a difficult thing to tell Mr. Smith I had promised to write one for him, or indeed any thing else. I say, it is evident, that a man, who will make one false statement, will another, and no confidence ought to be placed in his representations.

Another piece of uncandid dealing on the part of McCarty towards me, appears in that part of his statement, in which he says, he presented me with Mr. Jennings' letter for my concurrence; the truth of the matter is, he presented me with three letters from Mr. Jennings; indeed he presented me with a number of letters, all of which he wished me to concur in. One of those letters was directed to Mr. Clay, and of which I have requested a copy from Abner McCarty, and which he refused to give me; therefore, I can quote it only from recollection. But I vouch for the correctness in substance. It stated about as follows. "That Abner McCarty was a man of numerous and respectable connections, and that the writer was solicitous the appointment should be made, not more on account of local, than general politics." If, however, my statement is incorrect, let Mr. McCarty give a copy of the letter, and it will speak for itself. I was not willing to attach myself to the numerous family connections of McCarty, or to the tail of any political jumbo; nor was I willing the appointment should be made solely for political purposes. I therefore, placed it on the ground of public good: Hence the qualification in my concurrence at the foot of Mr. Jennings' letter, which Mr. E. McCarty so much complains of. And above all, why does not the McCarty's by their agent Mr. Smith, publish all the letters in the case, which Mr. Jennings and myself gave? It is plain, it would not answer their invidious purposes. Enoch McCarty in his statement to Smith, says, that Abner would not have been an applicant for the office, if I had not promised to recommend him; the truth of the matter is, I refused in the first place to recommend Abner at all, and Enoch declared if I would not, he would be an applicant for the office

himself, and asked me if I would recommend him.

Let us see now, whether it was by my uncandid dealing towards Mr. McCarty that he lost the office. I need say but little on this part of the subject, as Mr. Jennings' letter of the 5th of October 1825, settles the question completely. He tells the secretary of the treasury in substance, that if I had not written a pressing letter in favor of Abner McCarty, before the date of his, that he had better wait, till time should enable him to make a more satisfactory appointment: impeaching Abner, in language, which could not be misunderstood, with making false representations to him, to filch from him a pressing letter in his favor; Mr. Rush could not help but see I had written no such previous letter, because he finds I had only concurred in Mr. Jennings' letters after they were written, & that the representations mentioned by Mr. Jennings as made to him were false as suspected. Hence, Mr. Rush must have concluded, that the appointment of Abner would be very unsatisfactory; and it would indeed have been a piece of madness in him to make it.

Here I would beg leave to remark, that it has been usual to recommend many persons to an office, and leave the Departments to decide upon the merits or claims of the applicants. I have always thought it would be more consistent for each member of Congress to recommend but one; but I have through courtesy and impertinence, yielded to the practice, because, if I refused, I was told, why other members do so, and why do you wish to be singular? and it would be set down against me as a piece of obstinacy rather than a correct course: Besides, if we were to adopt such a course, it would be said, that the same confusion to the departments would follow, as does, when many are recommended; because in that case each member, perhaps, would recommend his own friend, and the department would be as much at a loss to determine upon the merits of the applicants, as when many are recommended. However, in the case of the Receiver for the Brookville district, I adopted a principle, that I would recommend none, unless he would obtain a recommendation of the majority of the members from this state; and I pursued the principle undeviatingly: I required it of McCarty and General Noble, they complied with the terms, or I would not have recommended them. Mr. Jennings and Mr. Hendricks recommended Abner McCarty, Mr. Hendricks and General James Noble recommended Judge Mount, Ross Smiley, General Noah Noble and Major Gay of Wayne county; these were all I recommended for that appointment. Enoch McCarty, also, says, in his statement to Smith, that Abner and myself came to his office soon after the death of Lazarus Noble. That is true: Abner on the day Mr. Noble died, came down to Messrs. Brackenridge's mill; I was in company with Mr. James S. Coalcott, he called me out and informed me, that Mr. Noble was dead, and asked me to recommend him for the office; I told him he was in a hurry, and I would do nothing in the affair at that time; and remarked to him, that his early application would be censured. He left me, and I returned again to where Mr. Coalcott was at work, who remarked to me, that he knew what Abner's business was, and I think, remarked at the same time he was in a hurry. I think I did not let him know Abner's business. In the afternoon as I walked from my house down to the town, Abner fell in company with me, and asked me, if I would go to his brother Enoch's office, that he wanted to see me. I went with him, and while there, I consented that if Abner would obtain the recommendation of two other members of Congress I would recommend him; and he started that night. I mention these things only to repel the insinuation in E. McCarty's statement to Smith, that I came to his office voluntarily; it was at the request of Enoch himself, as stated to me by Abner. Mr. Noble died on the 29th of September last; Abner returned, I think on the 3d day of October before day light in the morning; Enoch McCarty called me out of bed, I rose, and was getting pen and paper to write a letter for Abner, when it was suggested by Enoch or me—I do not know which—to concur in the letters he had. He threw down several for me to concur in. I did not like the phraseology of one of them, and concurred in them in such a manner as I thought correct; and in the qualified terms mentioned by E. McCarty, putting the appointment on the ground of public good. Mr. E. McCarty, I believe, did ask me, if that condition did not weaken the request? I replied, by asking him if he wished the appointment if inconsistent with the public good? he smiled, and said not. I offered to write him a separate letter, but he informed me the mail had gone out towards the East over night, that he had employed a man to follow it, and overtake it; that he was doubtful, if I took time to write separate letters the mail could not be reached, by which means he would be thrown a few days back; and was fearful, the appointment would be made before the recommendations arrived at the department. So, that if there be any fault in the manner of recommending Mr. A. McCarty, it originated with Enoch and not with me. To have concurred in his letters without such qualifications appears, I could not; & he would not give me time to write separate letters. I think from the whole of the case, and I can prove every material fact (as I have the documents,) which I have alleged; and I know I can prove much more if necessary, or if the company should think proper to deny the facts stated: From whence I draw this conclusion, that if there has been uncandid dealing it was with Smith and the McCarty's, and not with me; and if Abner has lost the office, it is chargeable on himself or his friends, not on me.

My letter to Judge Mount, who was never talked of as a candidate for Congress, gives the lie to the assertion that I wished to get Genl. Noble out of my way. If that had been my motive, I never should have hazarded the giving of the Judge so strong a letter of character as I did, particularly, when I knew that Mr. Southard, the secretary of the Navy was his special friend, and one of the cabinet. I have evidently placed the claims of Genl. Noble, and Judge Mount, on that of character alone, avoiding every thing like a special request for the appointment. And, here, let me notice a fact in this affair, which ought to eternally disgrace every actor concerned in their publication. It will be seen, that in my letter to the President in favor of Genl. Noble I say, I refer you to my letters of last winter, respecting his qualifications for public employment; my sentiments in that respect have not changed; thereby, clearly excluding all idea of a special

request for his appointment, by referring particularly to his qualifications for public employment; & I say, "in that respect" (that is in respect to his qualifications) my sentiments have not changed." Now mark the baseness of Mr. Smith and his coadjutors! they to make my letter to Noah Noble appear a special letter, have substituted in their publication, the words on that subject, instead of in that respect, thereby, endeavoring to make it appear, as tho' I referred to the subject of the General's appointment for Marshal and not in respect to his qualifications. It should seem, as though they were willing to be guilty of a forgery to make it appear, that I had stated a falsehood. And I would ask, if any person, who would be guilty of basely altering a man's letter, for the purpose of destroying his reputation, would not just as soon, be guilty of altering his bond to pick his pocket? Suppose I altered a man's letter to destroy his reputation; am I not equally as guilty as though I had altered his bond, to rob him of his money? I am more guilty. The offence in either case ought to take a man's ears. I have no hesitation in saying, that if Mr. Smith had not been concerned in the fact of altering my letter, he would himself, as Prosecuting Attorney, contend most strenuously before a court of justice, that the crime of altering a letter to destroy reputation, deserved to be punished as severely as for forging a bond or a note.

Let the honest community now Judge, whether Mr. Smith has been governed by motives of public good or not. I excuse the printer, I presume he knows nothing about it. Nay, I would ask in conclusion, if Mr. Smith has exhibited to the public that honesty and candor, which he has openly avowed, I have not; when he must knowingly, and willingly, and deliberately too, have suppressed that portion of the testimony, which tends to contradict his assertions; to explain away the transaction complained of, and to enable the people, to whom he has appealed, to pass a righteous judgment upon my conduct? A witness, I have always understood, is bound to tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as well for as against the accused. If he swerves from this rule—if he exposes every thing on one side of the question, and designedly suppresses material matter on the other—he violates, to all intents and purposes his oath; he misleads the judge; he occasions injustice to fall on the innocent; and forfeits his character, as a man of truth and integrity. Whether Mr. Smith has dealt similarly by me, I leave the tribunal before which he has arraigned me to determine. I am charged by him with want of candor in a particular transaction; & how does he prove it? I answer, by publishing Mr. Jennings' first letter, & suppressing his second one; by spreading before the public my letter to General Noble, not in its original language entire—but by substituting different words, admitting of a different construction, and never muttering to the winds even the existence of Judge Mount's letter, or its character. By such means, and such only, has he attempted to establish his charges against me. Another remark, and I have done. Mr. Smith pretends he is defending himself: Had he never made the attack upon me, would he at this time had any thing to defend against? If he has not made attacks on me and General Noble, very different from the one stated in his publication, he is much belied. But I hazard the assertion, that he has; and that it can be proved by men, who Mr. Smith will not dare to contradict. I shall now leave the subject, and let the people decide, whether Mr. Smith, is defending himself against an attack, or whether he has picked up another man's quarrel for the purpose of persecuting me. It is susceptible of proof, that Mr. Smith has been harping upon this thing last winter, long before he knew what I had done, or what I had written: and I firmly believe, if he had not meddled with the McCarty's, they would long since have been perfectly satisfied. The statement of General Noble is submitted without comment: It goes to prove some of the statements I have made.

JOHN TEST.

Brookville, 18th July, 1826.

Sir—I rec'd yours of this date, and so far as I am able will reply to your enquiries in the order you have arranged them.

To the 1st. I have heard Mr. E. McCarty say he would have been an applicant if it had not have been for his brother applying, and that he told you so.

2d. I did inform Mr. A. McCarty on the day of the date of your letter to me, that you had recommended me, but that it was general; and more than once have had conversation on that subject. The fact of your writing that letter, I never attempted to keep a secret; I spoke of it after, and have as often heard of your speaking of it. He, Mr. McCarty, did not express any dissatisfaction till after my appointment.

3d. The Mr. McCarty's did tell me that you had refused to recommend Abner, unless he would get two other members to unite on him. You did refuse to recommend me till I would get two others, and informed me you required it of all; which I also learned from others who applied to you.

4th. In conversation the McCarty's have both told me, my letter and Judge Mount's were general letters; but lately Mr. E. McCarty has told me he thinks mine special. As to yours in favor of Mr. A. McCarty, they both have told me it was special, but have since objected to the qualification—"If consistent with public good."

5th. Mr. McCarty did tell me he had three letters from Gov. Jennings, copies of which he said he had kept. As to Mr. Jennings writing against him, I can't say; but the second letter of Gov. J. it is said, destroyed the effect the first was intended to have.

6th. The penalty of my official bond is \$80,000, to which the Mr. McCarty's (A. & E.) have been kind enough to subscribe as two of my sureties.

To your interrogatories I have given answers

as far as I am able; in doing which, I wish it understood that I do not take an interest in your defence. With the Mr. McCarty's I am on friendly terms, which I do not wish interrupted. And I want it further understood, that any statement of facts within my knowledge, I shall feel myself at liberty to give them if required.

Yours Respectfully,
N. NOBLE.

The Hon. JOHN TEST.
LAWRENCEBURGH.
SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1826.

We have just room to observe, that for the want of it, we are compelled to exclude a great number of original and selected articles, prepared for this number. They will be attended to hereafter.

In our last, we gave a report concerning the recent tragical events at Frankfort, Ky. You will see the confirmation as to Beauchamp. In relation to Desha, it is pretty certain that he is dead from the wound inflicted on his throat.

It now becomes our duty to record a transaction which, in point of madness and desperation, forms a parallel with those above alluded to. These are the circumstances, as related to us—Daniel Fuller, of Georgetown, in this county, understanding that a story, prejudicial to his moral character, had got in circulation, went to the house of—Golden, (his father-in-law,) with a paper, written in the form of a libel, and insisted on two young girls, (Miss Golden's) to sign it; charging them with circulating the report. David Golden, their brother, a youth of 18 or 19, deeming Fuller's conduct improper, told him, F. that the girls should not sign the paper. Fuller then observed he would prosecute the girls for slander, and started for home. Golden took his gun and followed him. On coming up with Fuller he enquired if he really intended to prosecute the girls. He said he did. Golden then observed, "it will stop you," and immediately presented his gun, which mist fire. He then tried the gun a second time, when it went off and wounded F. in the side. Fuller picked up a club and threw at G. and then went for his house, where he arrived before he fell. Golden turned and went a short distance to a fence, reloaded his gun, and with the assistance of the ramrod, shot himself in the breast. Surgical aid was procured as soon as possible, but in vain.—Death, with iron grasp, was fast drawing them to the embrace of the grave. Both expired on the 15th, in the morning, about the same time. Fuller, at his own request, was interred by the side of A. Fuller, who was executed at this place, some time since. Fuller had a family, who are thus hastily bereft of a husband, father, brother, & uncle.

Dr. John L. Richmond will preach in the Meeting House on Sabbath evening; to commence at early candle light.

Cincinnati, July 18.

By several respectable gentlemen who came passengers in the steam boat Eliza yesterday, from Wheeling, we learn the demise of JOHN ADAMS who died about 5 o'clock on the morning of the Fourth of July. Thus have departed, "for another and a better world," on the same day, and within a few hours of each other, THOMAS JEFFERSON and JOHN ADAMS, two of the venerable compatriots of the Revolution—signers of the Declaration of Independence—and Ex Presidents of the United States. A more singular and striking coincidence, perhaps, is not to be found in the annals of history. That the soul of one should take its flight just at the hour when peals of artillery were echoing from one extent of the Union to the other, in honor of a day when a dauntless few declared to the world, that these United Colonies "are, and of right ought to be, FREE and INDEPENDENT States," and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, in support of their declaration; and of the other at an hour when thousands were listening to the Declaration of Independence, of which he was the author, is a circumstance too extraordinary to be fully realized. But such is the fact, too well authenticated for the most fastidious to doubt, even for a moment. [Com. Adv.

From the National Republican.

Cincinnati, July 11. Departed this life in this city, on the 7th instant, in the 19th year of her age, after a short illness, Mrs. ELIZABETH REYNOLDS. She has left a disconsolate husband, and a number of near and dear relatives and friends to lament her untimely death. She was the daughter of Mr. Moses Guest, late from New Brunswick, New-Jersey. The disease which occasioned her dissolution she sustained with christian fortitude, and pious resignation to the will of her heavenly father. She was blessed with a cheerful, mild, and benevolent disposition, which greatly endeared her to all her numerous friends and acquaintance. Her whole walk and conversation thro' life was such as to warrant the firm belief that She has landed safe on that blest shore. Where sickness, pain, & grief disturb no more.

"They were marrying and giving in marriage until the flood came"—and so it will continue to be to the end of the world.

MARRIED—On Sunday the 16th instant, by Daniel Hagerman, Esq. Mr. JAMES M. DARRAGH to Miss MARGARET GRISWOLD.

—On the same day, by the Rev. James L. Thompson, Mr. THOMAS MARSHALL to Miss LUCRETIA PROTZMAN—all of this place.

GUNSMITHING.

THE Subscriber takes this method to inform the citizens throughout the adjacent country, that he has established a factory in the town of Lawrenceburgh, where the above mentioned business will be carried on in all its various branches,—Making, mending and repairing guns of all descriptions.—Surgical instruments, and all other kinds of Cutlery, at the shortest notice, in the neatest and best manner, and on the most moderate terms.

JOHN B. CARRINGTON.

Lawrenceburgh, 22, 1826.