

to accede to their proposition that, if I was elected President, Mr. Adams would be continued Secretary of State, (inucendo, there would be no room for Kentucky.) [Is this Gen. Jackson's inucendo or that of the distinguished member of Congress?] "That the friends of Mr. Clay stated the West does not want to separate from the West, and if I would say, or permit any of my confidential friends to say that, in case I was elected President, Mr. Adams should not be continued secretary of state, by a complete union of Mr. Clay and his friends, they would put an end to the Presidential contest in one hour; and he was of opinion it was right to fight such intriguers with their own weapons." To which the General states himself to have replied in substance, "that in politics as in every thing else my guide was principle, and contrary to the expressed and unbiased will of the people or their constituted agents, I never would step into the Presidential chair; and requested him to say to Mr. Clay and his friends (for I did suppose he had come from Mr. Clay, although he used the terms *Mr. Clay's friends*) that before I would reach the Presidential chair by such means of bargain and corruption, I would see the earth open and swallow both Mr. Clay, and his friends and myself with them." Now all these professions are very fine and display admirable purity.—But its sublimity would be somewhat more impressive, if some other person than Gen. Jackson had proclaimed it. He would go into the Presidential chair but never, never contrary to the expressed and unbiased will of the people, or their constituted agents; two modes of arriving at it the more reasonable, as there happens to be no other constitutional way. He would see "the earth open and swallow both Mr. Clay and his friends and myself," before he would reach the Presidential Chair by "such means of bargain and corruption." I hope Gen. Jackson did not intend that the whole human race should be also swallowed up, on the contingency he has stated, nor that they were to guaranty that he has an absolute repugnance to the employment of any exceptional means to secure his elevation to the Presidency. If he had rendered the distinguished member of congress a little more distinguished, by instantly ordering him from his presence, and by forthwith denouncing him and the infamous proposition which he bore, to the American public, we should be a little better prepared to admit the claims to untarnished integrity, which the General so modestly puts forward. But, according to his own account, a corrupt and scandalous proposal is made him; the person who conveyed it advises him to accept it, and yet that person still retains the friendship of Gen. Jackson who is so tender of his character that his name is carefully concealed, and reserved to be hereafter brought forward as a witness! A man who, if he be a member of the House of Representatives, is doubly infamous—infamous for the advice which he gave, and infamous for his willingness to connive at the corruption of the body of which he was a sworn member—is the credible witness by whom Gen. Jackson stands ready to establish the corruption of men whose characters were never questioned.

Of all the properties which belong to honorable men, not one is so highly prized as that of character. Gen. Jackson cannot be insensible to its value, for he appears to be most anxious to set forth the loftiness and purity of his own. How has he treated mine? During the dispensation of the hospitalities of the Hermitage, in the midst of a mixed company, composed of individuals from various states, he permits himself to make certain statements respecting my friends and me, which, if true, would forever dishonor and degrade us. The words are hardly passed from his mouth, before they are committed to paper, by one of his guests, and transmitted in the form of a letter, to another state, where they are published in a newspaper, and thence circulated throughout the Union. And now he pretends these statements were made, "without any calculation that they were to be thrown into the public journals." Does he reprove the indiscretion of the guest who had violated the sanctity of a conversation at the hospitable board? Far from it. The public is incredulous. It cannot believe that Gen. Jackson would be so wanting in delicacy and decorum. The guest appeals to him for the confirmation of the published statements; and the General promptly addresses a letter to him, in which "he most unequivocally confirms" (says C. Beverley) all I have said regarding the overture made to him pending the last Presidential election before Congress; and he asserts a great deal more than he ever told me." I should be glad to know if all the versions of the tale have now made their appearance, and whether Gen. Jackson will allege that he did not calculate

upon the publication of his letter of the 6th of June.

The General states that the unknown envoy used the terms "Mr. Clay's friends," to the exclusion therefore of myself, but he nevertheless inferred that he had come from me. Now why did he draw his inference contrary to the import of the statement which he received? Does not this disposition to deduce conclusions unfavorable to me manifest the spirit which actuates him? And does not General Jackson exhibit throughout his letter a desire to give a coloring to the statements of his friend, the distinguished member of Congress, higher than they would justify? No one should ever resort to implication but from necessity. Why did he not ascertain from the envoy if he had come from me? Was any thing more natural than that General Jackson should ascertain the persons who had deputed the envoy? If his shocked sensibility and indignant virtue and patriotism would not allow him to enquire into particulars, ought he to have hazarded the assertion, that I was privy to the proposal, without assuring himself of the fact?

Could he not after rejecting the proposal, continuing as he did on friendly terms with the organ of it, have satisfied himself if I were cognizant of it. If he had not time then might he not have ascertained the fact from his friend or from me during the intervening two and a half years? The compunctions of his own conscience, for a moment, appear to have visited him towards the conclusion of his letter, for he there does say, "that in the supposition stated, I may have done injustice to Mr. Clay; if so the gentleman informing me can explain." No good or honorable man will do another voluntarily any injustice. It was not necessary that Gen. Jackson should have done me any. And he cannot acquit himself of the rashness and iniquity of his conduct towards me by referring at this late day, to a person, whose name is withheld from the public. This compendious mode of administering justice, by first hanging and then trying a man, however justifiable it may be, according to the precepts of the Jackson code, is sanctioned by no respectable system of jurisprudence.

It is stated in the letter of the 6th of June, that the overture was made early in January; and that the 2d day after the communication it "was announced in the newspapers" "that Mr. Clay had come out openly and avowedly in favor of Mr. Adams." The object of this statement is obvious. It is to insinuate that the proposal which was rejected with disdain by Gen. Jackson was accepted with promptitude by Mr. Adams. This renders the fact as to the time of the alleged communication very important. It is to be regretted that Gen. Jackson had not been a little more precise. It was early in January that the overture was made, and the second day after, the announcement of my intention took place. Now I will not assert that there may not have been some speculations in the newspapers about that time (although I do not believe that there were even any speculations so early) as to the probable vote which I should give; but I should be glad to see any newspaper which the second day after early in January, asserted in its columns, that I had come out "openly and avowedly in favor of Mr. Adams." I challenge the production of such a paper. I do not believe that my intention so to vote for Mr. Adams was announced in the newspapers openly and avowedly during the whole month of January, or at any rate until late in the month. The only avowal of my intention to vote for him which was publicly made in the newspapers, prior to the election, is contained in my letter to Judge Brooke, which is dated the 28th January. It was first published in the Enquirer at Richmond some time in the ensuing month. I go further; I do not believe that any newspaper at Washington can be produced announcing, before the latter part of January, the fact whether upon my avowal or not, of my intention to vote for Mr. Adams. Gen. Jackson's memory must deceive him. He must have confounded events and circumstances. His friends Mr. George Kremer, in his letter to the Columbian Observer, bearing date the 25th January, has according to my recollection of the public prints, a claim to the merit of being the first or among the first to announce to the public my intended vote. That letter was first published at Philadelphia, and returned in the Columbian Observer to Washington City of the 31st January. How long before its date that letter was written for Mr. Kremer does not appear. Whether there be any connexion between the communication made by the distinguished member of Congress and that letter perhaps Gen. Jackson can explain.

At the end of more than two years after a corrupt overture is made to Gen. Jackson he now, for the first time openly proclaims

it. It is true as I have ascertained since the publication of Mr. Beverley's Fayetteville letter, the General has been for a long time secretly circulating the charge. Immediately on the appearance at Washington of that letter in the public prints, the Editor of the Telegraph asserted, in his paper, that Gen. Jackson had communicated the overture to him about the period of the election, not as he now states but according to Mr. Beverley's version of the tale. Since I left Washington the 10th of last month, I have understood that Gen. Jackson has made a similar communication to several other persons, at different and distant points. Why has the overture been thus clandestinely circulated? Was it that through the medium of the Telegraph, the leading paper supporting the interest of Gen. Jackson, and through his other depositories, the belief of the charge should be daily and gradually infused into the public mind, and thus contribute to the support of his cause? The zeal and industry with which it has been propagated in the daily columns of certain newspapers can testify. Finding the public still unconvinced, has the General found it to be necessary to come out in proper person through the thin veil of Mr. Carter Beverley's agency.

When the alleged overture was made, the election remained undecided. Why did not Gen. Jackson then hold up to universal scorn and indignation the infamous bearer of the proposal, and those who dared to insult honor and temper with his integrity? If he had, at that time, denounced all the infamous parties concerned, demanded an enquiry in the H. of R. and established by satisfactory proof the truth of his accusation, there might and probably would have been a different result to the election. Why, when at my instance, a committee was on the 5th day of February 1825, (only four days before the election) appointed to investigate the charges of Mr. Kremer, did not Gen. Jackson present himself and establish their truth? Why on the 7th of that month, two days before the election, when the committee reported that Mr. Kremer declined to come forward and that "if they knew of any reason for such investigation they would have asked to be clothed with the proper power, but not having themselves any such knowledge they have felt it to be their duty only to lay before the House the communication which they have received;"—why did not Gen. Jackson authorize a motion to recommend the report and manfully come forward with all his information? The Congress of the Nation is in session. An important election has devolved on it. All eyes are turned towards Washington. The result is awaited with intense anxiety and breathless expectation. A corrupt proposition, affecting the election, is made to one of the Candidates. He receives it, is advised to accept, deliberates, decides upon it. A Committee is in session to investigate the very charge. The candidate not withstanding remains profoundly silent, and, after the lapse of more than two years, when the period of another election is rapidly approaching, in which he is the only competitor for the office for the first time, announces it to the American public! They must have more than an ordinary share of credulity who do not believe that General Jackson labours under some extraordinary delusion.—

It is possible that he may urge, by way of excuse for what must be deemed his culpable concealment of meditated corruption, that he did not like to volunteer as a witness before the committee, or to transmit to it the name of his friend, the distinguished member of the H. of R. although it is not very easy to discern any just reason for his volunteering now which would not have applied with more force at that time. But what apology can be made for his failure to discharge his sacred duty as an American Senator? More than two months after the alleged overture, my nomination to the office which I now hold, was made to the Senate of the United States, of which Gen. Jackson was then a sworn member. On that nomination he had to deliberate and act, in the most solemn manner. If I were privy to a corrupt proposal to Gen. Jackson, touching the recent election; if I had entered into a corrupt bargain with Mr. Adams to secure his elevation, I was unworthy the office to which I was nominated; and it was the duty of Gen. Jackson, if he really possessed the information which he now puts forward, to have moved the Senate to appoint a committee of enquiry, and by establishing my guilt, to have preserved the National Councils from an abominable contamination. As to the conspiracy of George Kremer & Co. who a short time before, meanly shrunk from appearing before the committee of the H. of R. to make good their charges. I requested a Senator of the United States when my nomination should be taken up, to ask of the Senate the appointment of a committee of

enquiry, unless it should appear that it was altogether unnecessary. One of our own Senators was compelled by the urgency of his private business, to leave Washington, before my nomination was discussed; and, as I had but little confidence in the fidelity of the professional friendship of the other, I was constrained to present my application to the Senator from another state. I was afterwards informed that, when it was acted upon, Gen. Jackson and every other Senator present, was silent as to the imputations now made, no one presuming to question my honor or integrity. How can Gen. Jackson justify to his conscience or to his country, this palpable breach of his public duty? It is in vain to say that he gave a silent negative vote. He was in possession of information, which, if true, must have occasioned the rejection of my nomination. It does not appear that any other Senator possessed the same information. I was a delegate was alike due to the purity of the National Council, to me, and as an act of strict justice, to all the other parties implicated. It is impossible for him to escape from the dilemma that he has been faithless, as a Senator of the United States or has lent himself to the circulation of an atrocious calumny.

After the election, Gen. Jackson was among the first who eagerly pressed his congratulations upon his successful rival. If Mr. Adams had been guilty of the employment of impure means to effect his election, Gen. Jackson ought to have declined to sully his own hands by touching those of his corrupt competitor.

On the 10th of February, 1825, the very next day after the election, Gen. Jackson was invited to a public dinner at Washington, by some of his friends. He expressed to them his wish that he might be excused from accepting the invitation, because, alluding to the recent election, he said, "any evidence of kindness and regard such as you propose, might, by many, be viewed as conveying with it exoneration, murmuring, and feelings of complaint, which I sincerely hope belong to none of my friends." More than one month after the corrupt proposal is pretended to have been received, and after according to the insinuation of Gen. Jackson, a corrupt arrangement had been made between Mr. Adams and me—after the actual termination of an election, the issue of which was brought about, according to Gen. Jackson by the basest of means, he was unwilling to accept the honors of a public dinner, lest it should imply even an exception against the result of the election.

Gen. Jackson professes in his letter of the 6th of June—I quote again his words, "to have always intended should Mr. Clay come out over his own signature, and only having any knowledge of the communication made by his friends to my friends and to me, that I would give him the name of the gentleman through whom the communication came." He pretends never to have seen the Fayetteville letter; and yet the pretext of a denial under my signature is precisely that which had been urged by the principal editors who sustain his cause. If this be an unconcerned, it is nevertheless a most wonderful coincidence. The General never communicated to me his professed intention, but left me in entire ignorance of his generous purpose; like the overture itself, it was profoundly concealed from me. There was an authorized denial from me, which went the circle of the public prints, immediately after the arrival at Washington of the Fayetteville letter. In that denial my words are given. They were contained in a letter dated at Washington City, on the 18th day of April last, and are correctly stated to have been "that the statement that his (my) friends had made such a proposition as the letter describes, to the friends of Gen. Jackson was, as far as he knew or believed, utterly destitute of foundation; that he was unwilling to believe that Gen. Jackson had made any such statement; but that no matter with whom it had originated, he was fully persuaded it was a gross fabrication, of the same calumnious character with the Kremer story, put forth for the double purpose of injuring his public character, and propping the cause of Gen. Jackson; and that for himself and for his friends he defied the substantiation of the charge before any fair tribunal whatever." Such were my own words transmitted in the form of a letter from a friend to a known person. Whereas the charge which they repelled was contained in a letter written by a person then unknown to some person also unknown. Did I not deny the charge under my own signature in my Card, of the 31st of January, 1825, published in the National Intelligencer? Was not there a substantial denial of it in my letter to Judge Brooke, dated the 28th of the same month? In my circular to my constituents? In my Lewisburgh Speech? And may I not add, in the whole tenor of