

88 7 4 22
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 annunciation 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.

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

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 depositaries, 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 6th 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 recommit the report and mansly 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 notwithstanding 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 shrank 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