# STAR, AND NORTH CAROLINA STATE GAZETTE.

NO. 35 RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1827. VOL XVIII.

## THE STAR,

*and North-Carolina State Gazette,*
Published, weekly, by
LAWRENCE & LEMAY.

TERMS. *Subscription*, three dollars per annum. No paper will be sent without at least $1 50 is paid in advance, and no paper discontinued, but at the option of the Editors, unless all arrearages are paid. *Advertisements*, not exceeding fifteen lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each continuance.—All letters to the editors must be *post-paid*.


## COMMUNICATION

FOR THE STAR.

### THE INFLUENCE OF OPINION.

This appears to be an age of animadversion. Scarcely any subject passes before the public, against which some person has not something to say. And notwithstanding the Almighty has given us a rule of life, by which to judge and determine matters, yet so fond are we of self, that, regardless of rule and divine authority, we often substitute our *own opinion* as a standard by which to measure the principles and conduct of others. Whether this be correct in other men or not, it certainly is not in the man calling himself a christian. For to him in a special manner, the *Bible* is given for a rule of faith and practice. And whatever cannot be proved from this sacred code, to be contrary to the will of God, he, in particular, should be exceedingly careful not to censure; for in so doing he would be in danger of committing himself. "Add thou not unto his word," says Solomon, "lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." And a greater than Solomon says, "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." The Lord himself is judge, and on what he has not seen cause to lay any prohibition, no man dare (except at his peril) positively to interdict. An opinion he may have, that this or that is wrong, but then he should not by this, determine the character of other men; for they have as much right to their opinion as he has to his. *Mere opinion* is but the persuasion of the mind without proof, and ought not therefore to be adduced by any as a criterion, but kept separate from that conviction of the mind which is supported by fact. And in the general it might be most prudent for men to keep their opinions to themselves, or else when expressing them, to take care that it be distinctly understood, that what they say is mere matter of opinion, and not matter of fact. For a man to hazard an opinion of his own as a rule of life for other men to be governed by, and to thunder anathamas against those who pursue a contrary course, is, to say the least of it, arrogating much to himself. Such conduct is an outrage upon the rights of other men: a plant not of christian growth, and a principle very destructive of the peace and well being of the community at large. Ought not every man to be careful then, how he assumes a position which he cannot maintain upon christian ground? Young persons, we know, are very apt to imbibe the opinions of older ones in the same profession with themselves: and children those of their parents. This is frequently the reason why erroneous sentiments are transmitted from one generation to another, without being examined either by father or son.

Among the many subjects that are frequently opposed with but little knowledge of them, and but little power to look argumentatively into them, are those of *masonry* and *lotteries*. *First of masonry.* How often do we hear even those, who have candour enough to acknowledge they know nothing of the system, expressing their disapprobation to a man who is of this fraternity! And wherefore? Is it because he is worse than other men? Or than many who call themselves christians? No. Is it because some who bear *this name* are dissipated and bad men? This certainly can be no objection against the system *itself*, for if it is, an equal objection would be against *the system of christianity*; for many of its votaries have proved themselves bad men. True it is, that some who were *masons* previously to their embracing religion, have, after becoming christians absented themselves from the Lodge. But even these will acknowledge that the system *in itself* is good. But on the other hand some have become masons subsequently to their becoming christians, and maintained as good a moral character afterwards as they did before. "But they profess to have a secret which is known to none but themselves, which, in my opinion, is only a proselyting policy." It may be so or it may not, this none can tell, who know not the science, and therefore it is going too far to speak against masonry, as some do, because this or that is their opinion. *Opinion*, let it be remembered, is *one thing and matter of fact is another*. That there are some things worthy of imitation, connected with the masonic system, all must agree, who have read what is written on the subject. These things we know, and of them we may form ideas, but of those of which we have no knowledge we had better form no opinion, or at least express none, but leave them to stand or fall upon their own merits. These remarks are not made because the writer himself is a mason; for he frankly confesses he is not, nor has he any idea that he ever shall be one, but merely as an instance to shew the impropriety of persons, and especially those who profess to be the followers of Christ, speaking against any thing of which they have no knowledge, and because thus and thus is their *opinion* respecting it.

Secondly as to *lotteries*. These, it must be confessed, are more of the nature of common stock than masonry. But also against them there are many who have much to say, & that perhaps in a degree, from the want of ability to look argumentatively into their true nature. Though with some it is from prejudice, either of education or profession, and not for the want of ability, &c. that the whole concern is in their opinion exceedingly sinful. One of the objections against lotteries is, that no man can in justice receive any thing, (except in a gratuitous way,) unless he gives for it an equivalent. But surely this will not lie; for, on this ground there could be no acquiring any thing, either by trade or industry. *An equivalent would be but an equivalent*, and there could no profit arise to the mechanic for his labour, to the farmer for his industry, or to the merchant for the venture he makes in trade. We will suppose a case: A mechanic is applied to, to do a certain piece of work: His price is asked: He makes his calculations and ascertains that the cost will be so much; he then adds on so much more for the profit. Is this an equivalent? If not, and he is not to blame for what he does, how is a man to blame for buying a lottery ticket, because it is possible that he may draw a prize? Again, a merchant buys goods to a certain amount: He lays on an average advance of fifty per cent; this yields him a profit of one half the whole cost. Is this an equivalent? Surely not. The only difference then between the merchant and a lottery ticket buyer appears to be this, the latter perhaps gets rich at once, and the former by degrees and so of the farmer and the mechanic. "But the disproportion of profits between the lottery ticket buyer and these other persons is so great, that the cases are very dissimilar." A dissimularity as to profits, there may be, but if this makes the buying of a ticket sinful, then in case the ticket draws no prize the buyer commits no sin, or as the *mechanic*, the *farmer* or the *merchant* grows rich by his occupation in proportion with the lottery ticket buyer, so in proportion is one equally as culpable as the other; for the object of the whole is the same. "But not the fate of the ticket," says the objector, "but the act of purchasing, is what constitutes the sin." How can this be sinful, unless some *law* of God or the country is violated? Let this be proved and the subject will be put to rest. If a man should go to a lottery office and purchase a ticket for ten dollars, with which he draws twenty or a blank, how does he commit any more sin than the merchant does who buys an article for ten dollars which he sells for twenty, or which he never sells at all, but is finally lost? They have both acted honestly in the purchase they made, & have both shared the same fate in their speculating adventure.

Another objection is, that "in lotteries the managers, and those who vend the tickets, are not always honest, and that there is too great an opportunity given, for them to take the advantage of adventurers." Is this a necessary consequence or is it not? If it is, then the lottery system is defective *in itself* and ought to be discountenanced; for it is not possible that a lottery can exist without the existence of dishonesty as an inseparable ingredient. But this we know is not the fact, for lotteries of a certain kind were practised anciently, by old and new testament saints, and met the divine sanction, which we know would not have been the case if dishonesty is inseparable from the lottery system. But that there are underhanded dealings frequently carried on in respect to lotteries dare not be denied. But if this be any argument against them, the same is an argument against Church and State. But shall we for this reason say that all Church and State matters are wrong? God forbid. It follows then that there can be no crime in the simple act of purchasing a ticket, if the object of the institution be a good one. For I conceive that this is the grand hinge upon which hangs the propriety or impropriety of lottery establishments. As for instance, a lottery is authorised for building a *theatre*, or for some other like purpose, and we believe that theatres are a means of *corrupting* society, of *debauching* the youth, and of doing *much more harm than good* to the community. If a man therefore buys a ticket in any such scheme, by so much as it is wrong to *encourage vice*, by so much he is wrong in becoming a *purchaser*; for by so doing he encourages a *vicious institution*. But on the other hand a lottery is legally authorised to make a *turnpike road: To remove the obstructions from some otherwise unnavigable stream: To establish a free school*, or for some other purpose of a like nature, which would be of *public utility*. The man who buys a ticket in such a lottery, *contributes* the amount of the purchase towards the object for which the lottery is instituted. And by so much as it is right to *encourage* all institutions which have for their end the good of the community, by so much it is right to become an adventurer in any such lottery. "But this is sanctifying the means by the end, whereas the end ought *always* to sanctify the means." This objection perhaps is more specious than solid. A man, for instance sees another in danger of his life: He rushes forward at the hazard of his own, and the man is saved from perishing. Does such means as this sanctify the end? Or does the end sanctify the means? The end the means most unquestionably. And so of religion in general; for if it were not to the end that man might be saved there would be nothing to justify the mortifications and privations to which a christian life is incident. A man then would certainly be inexcusable to give five or ten dollars for a ticket in some lottery, if neither he nor any other person, nor yet the public, were to be benefitted by the purchase. But it is further objected that "the prospect of gain, and not a desire to profit the public, is what prompts men to become adventurers in lotteries." This no doubt is the case with many, but is no proof that it is so with all. And admitting it were, it ought not to be thought a sufficient argument to prove that it is criminal to purchase a ticket in any lottery. For if it were, the same argument will prove that it is criminal to purchase any article whatever; for it is not to profit the individual or the public (as the case may be) of whom the purchase is made, but ourselves that induces us to become purchasers. "But lotteries are a species of gambling." Are they so in fact, or only in opinion? If so *in fact*, let those who are able to prove *it* "bring forth their strong reasons." But if *only in opinion*, let not those whose opinion it is to condemn those who are of a contrary opinion; for *opinion* is but *opinion*, and as all men by nature are equally free, all men of course are equally priviledged to think for themselves. "To him" then, "that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean." It is an easy matter for men to take that for granted, which has never been proved. And this, perhaps, is what has influenced many persons to come out against those who have become adventurers in lotteries, and to pronounce them not only unfit for Church membership, but also for a place and name among honest men. But is this *charitable?* Is it according to the *strict principles of christianity?* Let reason answer. But perhaps it may be asked, "whether we have any scripture proof of the existence of lotteries?" Have we any against it? If not, would not the most charitable way be, to "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind?" But "to the law and to the testimony." For from these it may be made appear that lotteries *existed anciently*, which involved subjects of greater importance than those of a pecuniary nature. Solomon says "the *lot* is cast into the lap: but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord." What this lot was, is for those to make appear, who oppose *all lotteries*. One thing is obvious, that the lot (or lottery) here spoken of, was disposed of and approved by the Almighty. A lottery there was in the case of *Jonathan*, when contrary to the adjuration of Saul, and ignorant of any such restriction, he partook of a little Honey as food, on a day that the King had said that no man should eat, on pain of death. Also in the case of *Jonah*, when he fled from the presence of God, and essayed to go unto *Tarshish*, rather than to *Nineveh*, as he had been directed by the *Almighty*. In both these instances the object at stake, was more precious than hundreds of thousands of *silver or gold*, even the life of *Jonathon*, the King's son & a good man, who, but for the inteference of the army in his favour, would have died in consequence of the *lot* falling upon him. And also that of *Jonah*, (for all that he or any of the ship's crew knew to the contrary,) who was a Prophet of the "most high." Several other passages might be adduced, perhaps of equal weight, but one more ought to be sufficient, for "in the mouth of 2 or 3 witnesses shall every word be established." The case is that of *Matthias*, who by a lottery was chosen to the office of the ministry, and to that of an *Apostle*, in the place of Judas, who "by transgression fell." Thus we see that *lotteries* existed among the *old and new testament servants of God*, and that in matters of the most momentous kind. Let then *all persons* be careful, and *christians in particular*, how they traduce *any thing* because it is not according to *their* opinion. For "why," I would ask, "is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" And "who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth: yea he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand." Let then a spirit of forbearance, and of that "charity which suffereth long and is kind—that endureth all things—and that is not provoked," be cultivated by every man. And then we shall not be hasty to condemn a thing, of which we have no knowledge, or to find fault with that which we do not understand. Nor shall we be so imprudent as to set up *our opinion* as a criterion for others to be judged by, but shall be willing that *every man* should judge of all matters of conscience, on which the scriptures are silent, for *himself*. "Happy is he," says St. Paul, "who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." And happy would it be for every man and for all men collectively, if "every man would mind his own business," and be careful not to be "a busy body in other men's matters."

What is opinion? A mere thought of the
Mind: An idea sustained without proof. What
Is opinion? the property of all,
A fancy that's subject to change. Then let
It remain; nor dare its right to infringe.
The property of all by all should be
Held, (nor wrested by violent hands;) for
God has to all this privilege given.

ATHANASIUS.

## POLITICAL.

*From the United States Telegraph, Aug. 13.*

### MR. BUCHANAN'S STATEMENT

Is to day presented to our readers; it will be found in every essential point to corroborate that of Gen. Jackson, and forms one of the many links of circumstancial evidence which must satisfy the mind of every reflecting man that the election of Mr. Adams was produced by bargain. Gen. Jackson said:

"That in January, 1825, a member of Congress, of high respectability visited me one morning and observed—'he had been informed by the friends of Mr. Clay, that the friends of Mr. Adams had made overtures to them, saying, if Mr. Clay and his friends would unite in aid of the election of Mr. Adams, Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State; that the friends of Mr. Adams were urging as a reason to induce the friends of Mr. Clay to accede to this proposition, that if I was elected President, Mr. Adams would be continued Secretary of State (inuendo, there would be no room for Kentucky)—that the friends of Mr. Clay stated, the West did 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."

Mr. Buchanan says:

"In the month of December, 1824, a short time after the commencement of the session of Congress, I heard among other rumors that Gen. Jackson had determined, should he be elected President, to continue Mr. Adams in the office of Secretary of State.

"That Mr. Markley adverted to the rumor and said it was calculated to injure the General—that Mr. Clay's friends were warmly attached to him, and that he thought they would endeavor to act in concert at the election—that if they did so, they could either elect Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson, at their pleasure; but that many of them would never agree to vote for the latter, if they knew that he had predetermined to prefer another to Mr. Clay for the first office in his gift: *and that some of the friends of Mr. Adams had already been holding out the idea, that in case he were elected, Mr. Clay might probably be offered the situation of Secretary of State.* That Mr. Markley urged him to call on Gen. Jackson, and converse with him on the subject; and observed, if Gen. Jackson had not determined whom he would appoint Secretary of State, and should say *that it would not be Mr. Adams, it might be of great advantage to our cause for us to declare upon his authority.* We should then be *placed upon the same footing with the Adams men, and might fight them with their own weapons.* That the Western members would naturally prefer voting for a Western man, *if there was a probability* that the claims of Mr. Clay to the second office in the government should be fairly estimated, and that if they thought proper to vote for Gen. Jackson, *they could soon decide the contest in his favor.*"

Mr. Buchanan then mentions his calling to see Gen. Jackson, and says:

"*I proceeded to relate to him the substance of the conversation which I had held with Mr. Markley*—I do not remember whether I mentioned his name, or *merely described him as a friend of Mr. Clay.*"

Mr. Buchanan then proceeds with Gen. Jackson's reply, which, he says, he repeated to Mr. Markley, *this friend of Mr. Clay*, of course.

That this reply had its influence on the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends, none can doubt.

It is true that Mr. Buchanan denies that he went as the agent of Mr. Clay or his friends.—But he admits that he spoke of *Mr. Markley* as a friend of Mr. Clay, and says that Mr. Markley urged him to call on Gen. Jackson, and converse with him upon the subject. He knows, that although Mr. Markley voted for Gen. Jackson, yet he is one of those who, void of merit, use a great name to shield themselves from the scrutiny of their constituents, and to cover over the intrigues by which they purchase the favor of our present rulers, by the prostitution of official influence to electioneering purposes.

Mr. Buchanan's denial that he went as the agent of Mr. Clay and his friends, is very different from an acquittal of Mr. Clay and his friends from a desire to employ such an agent; or from the imputation that they profited by the use which he (Mr. B.) afterwards made of General Jackson's reply.

What was the case? The friends of Mr. Adams had said that, "*if Mr. Adams were elected Mr. Clay might probably be offered the situation of Secretary of State.*" Mr. Markley had *urged* Mr. B. to call on Gen. Jackson and converse with him on the subject, and observed—

"If Gen. Jackson had not determined whom he would appoint Secretary of State, *and should say it would not be Mr. Adams*, it might be of great advantage to our cause for us to declare upon *his authority*. We should then be placed upon the same footing *with the Adams men, and might fight them with their own weapons.*"

This, we have said on a former occasion, was the language of Mr. Markley, a known friend of Mr. Clay, who has since been rewarded by him with an office worth $3000 a year.—And Mr. Buchanan related it to Gen. Jackson as the language of a friend of Mr. Clay. It was to obtain this pledge, and under a belief that it would operate upon Mr. Clay and his friends that Mr. Buchanan called upon Gen. Jackson. Mr. B. when he says that he called upon Gen. Jackson as his friend, and not as the agent of Mr. Clay or any other person, speaks in defence of himself, and not of Mr. Clay and his friends.

This declaration of Mr. B. thetefore, which, no doubt, will be seized upon by Mr. Clay as an acquittal, forms another link in the chain of circumstances to condemn Mr. Clay. Did Mr. B. want the information for himself? No: he says that the reply of Gen. Jackson was such as he expected; and that he told Gen. Jackson that he did not want it for himself. For whom then did he want it?

Mr. B. explains; he says:

"I thought Gen. Jackson owed it to himself and to the cause in which his political friends were engaged, to contradict the report, *and to declare that he would not appoint, to that office, the man, however worthy he might be, who stood at the head of the most formidable party of his political enemies.*"

This was the desideratum. Mr. B. might well have believed that the part taken by Mr. Adams' friends made such a step on the part of Gen. Jackson necessary and *proper*; and it is manifest that Gen. Jackson considered *that* the gist of the proposition. It is manifest, too, that Mr. B. approached that part of the subject with great delicacy, reporting what had been said by a *friend of Mr. Clay*, in such a manner as to make a clear and distinct idea in the mind of Gen. Jackson. We repeat, that Mr. B.'s visit to Gen. Jackson had an object—that object is avowed to be to operate upon the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends. Mr. B. himself tells us that *Mr. Clay's* friend, Mr. Markley, had made a declaration by Gen. Jackson that he would *not* appoint Mr. Adams his Secretary of State, one of the conditions upon which Mr. Clay and his friends would "decide the contest in his favor," and it is manifest that Mr. B. intended to use such a pledge as a means of operating upon the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends, which he believed depended upon it. Mr. Buchanan might have done this without intending to pledge Gen. Jackson to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and such we are induced to believe was his purpose. He had seen the friends of Mr. Adams operating upon Mr. Clay and his friends, by the promise of office on the one hand, and the dread of a loss of office and influence on the other. He had seen the friends of Mr. Adams *falsely* charging that Gen. Jackson was pledged to appoint Mr. Adams Secretary of State, as a reason, in addition to a promise of that office to Mr. Clay, to influence the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends, and he was induced to believe that Gen. Jackson could be prevailed upon to declare that Mr. Adams would not be so appointed. Such a declaration, he knew, would not, of itself, amount to a pledge to appoint Mr. Clay or any other person, but would, he believed, be sufficient to influence the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends for Gen. Jackson.—This was all that he asked—this was all that Mr. Markley, *Mr. Clay's friend*, asked of Gen. Jackson—this is all that Gen. Jackson has said was asked of him—and this it is, which he and Mr. Buchanan both concur in saying, was refused. It will be readily seen, that Mr. Buchanan believed that the first object of Mr. Clay and his friends was to secure for him the Department of State, and that, in his opinion, their votes depended upon a simple pledge from Gen. Jackson that he would not appoint Mr. Adams to that office; and that, although Mr. Buchanan might have believed that such a pledge was proper, and would have left General Jackson perfectly at liberty to select whom he pleased; yet General Jackson having a different view of the premises, knew that such a pledge would be construed by Mr. Clay and his friends into a promise to appoint Mr. Clay, and, therefore, it would have been corrupt. No one can now hesitate to believe that, General Jackson, at that time, acted upon the supposition that Mr. Buchanan was well informed, and that the Presidential election depended upon the answer he was then called upon to give. How few are there who, under such circumstances, would have hesitated! How many men, thus situated would not have said: "I have not said that I will appoint Mr. Adams, and I will not appoint him." That Mr. Buchanan would have so said is manifest; because he says expressly that he thought "Gen. Jackson owed it to himself, and to the cause in which his political friends were engaged," so to say. But the old Roman, the incorruptible Jackson, knew that such a declaration, by him, would be construed into a pledge, on his part, to appoint Mr. Clay, and he refused. He preferred his own honor, and his country's glory to the charms of office, and sooner than make the pledge he gave up his high pretensions.

An anecdote illustrates this fact. On the evening of that day he was at the house of a lady in this city, the widow of a deceased friend. A son of Gen. Walter Jones, a little boy, said he did not want Gen. Jackson for President, "because," said he, "he will have us all hung." The General smiled, and, laying his hand gently on the child's head, remarked—"You need be under no apprehension, for I have done that this day, which will prevent my election." We have this anecdote from an eye witness, and we give it at this time to illustrate the feelings which dictated his reply to Mr. Buchanan.

We have before said, that Mr. Buchanan did not know the efforts which Mr. Clay had made in person to obtain an *explanation* from Gen. Jackson, and that on that account he did not know the coustruction which Mr. Clay would have been authorized to give to the pledge sought for from Gen. Jackson, and that therefore what Mr. B. might have considered a justifiable counteraction of the acts of Mr. Adams and his friends, was considered corruption by Gen. Jackson.

This brings us back to the original charge; did Mr. Clay and his friends seek the State Department as the price of their vote. We have here the concurrent testimony of Messrs Buchanan and Markley that they did. Mr. Buchanan says that he communicated Gen. Jackson's reply to Mr. Markley, and we can easily see that that reply closed every avenue through which Mr. Clay could expect the appointment from him.

The charge against Mr. Clay comes back to the original inquiry—Did Mr. Clay vote for Mr. Adams because he had ascertained that Mr. Adams would, and that Gen. Jackson would not, appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State. That Gen. Jackson's reply was, on the part of Mr. Clay and his friends, construed into a refusal on his part to appoint Mr. Clay, appears not only from the fact disclosed by Mr. Buchanan that the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends depended upon it, but from the confession of Mr. Trimble, who voted with Mr. Clay, and was one of his most active and confidential friends and partisans.

In Mr. Trimble's letter to his constituents, dated Washington, 9th of March, 1825, he says:

"In taking him, (Mr. Adams,) Kentucky has secured the friendship and good will of the Eastern States. Her friendship with Ohio and the other Western States is unimpaired. No jealousies have been created, nor heart burnings or ill-will. *Had she gone for Jackson, she would have failed, and lost her only chance of obtaining equal weight and influence in the Cabinet and Presidential Councils.* * * * * * * *She would have aided the enemies of Mr. Clay in putting him down, at a time when his services are most wanted.* In fact, she would have put herself down, *and him with her*, and sacrificed her best and highest interest in a hopeless effort made against her better judgment."

It is here admitted, that by voting for Mr. Adams, Kentucky obtained her *equal* influence in the Cabinet, which she would not have done by voting for General Jackson. It is admitted, too, that the election of Gen Jackson would have *put down* Mr. Clay. How did Mr. Clay and his friends know that Mr. Adams would appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State? How did they know that Gen. Jackson would not? If the vote of Mr. Clay and his friends depended upon the pledge to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, then Gen. Jackson's reply to Mr. Buchanan gives us the answer to the latter, and Mr Trimble gives us the former. Finding that his Circular did not satisfy his constituents on that point, after he reached home, in a speech, he said:

"When we got to Washington, we found that Crawford was out of the question. We ascertained, that if Gen. Jackson was elected he would not appoint our friend, Mr. Clay, Secretary of State. We then ascertained, DISTINCTLY, that if Mr. Adams should be elected, he would appoint Mr. Clay his Secretary of State."

These assertions of Mr. Trimble go the whole length; they leave no room for doubt; and show conclusively, that Mr. Clay and his friends voted for Adams, because they had distinctly ascertained that he would, and that Gen. Jackson would not, appoint Mr. Clay Seretary of State.

Mr. Clay, in his address to his constituents, says:

"I found myself transformed from a candidate before the people to an elector for the people; I *deliberately* examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before me upon which my judgment was to be formed or *reviewed*. If the eagerness of any of the heated partisans of the respective candidates suggested a tardiness in the declaration of my intention, I believed that the new relation in which I was placed to the subject imposed on me an addijonal obligation to pay some respect to delicacy and decorum.

Meanwhile, that very reserve supplied aliment to newspaper criticism."

We introduce this to prove the other part of General Jackson's statement; that, whereas the opinions of Mr. Clay and his friends had been a matter of conjecture, after his reply to Mr. Buchanan was made known Mr. Clay's reserve disappeared.

We are aware of the delicacy of Mr. Buchanan's situation. Mr. Clay endeavored to intimidate him in advance, and accordingly denounced him in his Lexington Speech. Mr. Buchanan felt the imputation that he was the bearer of a corrupt proposition, and in that part of his letter which relates to this subject has been chiefly desirous to exculpate *himself* from that charge.

This is easily understood and explained. We hear the partisans of Mr. Clay asserting that Mr. B. has acquitted Mr. Clay and his friends. Our purpose, to-day is to show that Mr. B. has in every essential point, sustained Gen. Jackson. We shall, hereafter, show more fully how he criminates Mr. Clay.

In the mean time, large calculations are made upon the effect which Mr. Buchanan's letter is to have in Pennsylvania. It is whispered that the Coalition have thrown open their arms widely, and hope to entice Mr. Buchanan to rush into their embrace. This he will not do.

The tacticians of the Journal, so ready to feast their readers with joyous news, have not yet resolved on what course to pursue. That they may no longer grope in the dark, we have given our view, and now give them an assurance that Mr. Buchanan remains the fast friend of Gen. Jackson.

*From the U. S. Telegraph, Aug. 15.*

### MR. BUCHANAN'S STATEMENT.

The Journal, of yesterday, gives us this statement, and five deductions from it, which prove with how small a show of innocence Mr. Clay is contented.

The conclusions of the Journal, manifestly authorized, if not written by Mr. Clay, are:

"1st. That Mr. Clay and his friends are entirely exonerated from the imputation of having made, or authorized, any proposition to Gen. Jackson or his friends, on the subject of the Presidential election."

General Jackson did not say that Mr. Clay, or his friends, had made, or authorized such proposition—he stated a fact, which, if true, as Mr. Clay himself admitted, led to the conclusion that such a proposition had been authorized by Mr. Clay or his feiends. The question of inference remains precisely where it was. If the fact stated by General Jackson be true, then Mr. Clay, himself, gives the inference from that fact, and saves us the trouble of making up an opinion. The fact stated by Gen. Jackson was, that Mr. Buchanan informed him that

"He had been informed, by the friends of Mr. Clay, that the friends of Mr. Adams had made overtures to them, saying, if Mr. Clay and his friends would unite in aid of the election of Mr. Adams, Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State. That the friends of Mr. Adams were urging, as a reason to induce the friends of Mr. Clay to accede to their proposition, that if I was elected President, Mr. Adams would be continued Secretary of State, (inuendo; there would be no room for Kentucky.) That the friends of Mr. Clay stated, the West did not wish to separate from the West; & 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."

The fact stated by Mr. Buchanan is, that Mr. Markley adverted to a rumour that General Jackson had resolved to appoint Mr. Adams Secretary of State, and said it was calculated to injure the General.

"He observed that Mr. Clay's friends were attached to him, and that he thought they would endeavor to act in concert at the election, that if they did so, *they could elect either Mr. Adams or General Jackson at their pleasure; but that many of them would never agree to vote for the latter, if they knew he had predetermined to prefer another to Mr. Clay, for the first office in his gift; and that some of the friends of Mr. Adams had already been holding out the idea that, in case he were elected Mr. Clay might probably* be offered the situation of Secretary of State."

Mr. Markley urged Mr. B. to call on General Jackson, and obtain a contradiction of the report, and observed:

"If General Jackson had not determined whom he would appoint Secretary of State, *and should say that it would not be Mr. Adams, it might be of great advantage to our cause, for us to declare, upon his own authority*, we should then be placed on the same footing with the Adams men, and might fight them with their own weapons. *That the Western Members would naturally prefer voting for a Western man, if there were a probability that the claims of Mr. Clay to the second office in the Government should be fairly estimated;* and that if they thought proper to vote for Gen. Jackson, they could soon decide the contest in his favor.

Here, then, it is clearly admitted as the opinion of Mr. Markley and of Mr. Buchanan, that the Western members would naturally prefer voting for a Western man, if there was a probability that the claims of Mr. Clay to the second office in the government, should be fairly estimated—and it is expressly stated, that if Gen. Jackson should say that Mr. Adams would not be Secretary of State, it might be of great advantage to the election of General Jackson so to declare *upon his authority*—and why? Mr. Markley explains. He said, "If they (Mr. Clay and his friends) thought proper to vote for Gen. Jackson, they could soon decide the contest in his favor."

Mr. Buchanan says that he did call on Gen. Jackson, that he proceeded to relate to him the conversation which he had held with Mr. Markley—and says, "I do not remember whether I mentioned his name, or merely *described him as a friend of Mr. Clay.*" That he merely described him as a friend of Mr. Clay, we have the concurrent evidence of Gen. Jackson, Major Eaton, and Mr. Kremer, to each of whom Mr. Buchanan detailed the same conversation at *the same time*. Then this conclusion of the Journal is not sustained: for in every essential point, the conversation of Mr. Markley is detailed by *Mr.* Buchanan to Gen. Jackson, is reported by each in as nearly the same words as any two witnesses, after the same lapse of time, could be expected to repeat any conversation.