

NORTH CAROLINA SENTINEL

AND

NEWBERN COMMERCIAL, AGRICULTURAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCER.

AUGUST 17, 1831.

LIBERTY...THE CONSTITUTION...UNION.

VOL. XV. NO. 18.

PUBLISHED BY THOMAS WATSON
At three dollars per annum—payable in advance.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM THE GLOBE.

MR. BERRIEN TO MR. BLAIR

WASHINGTON, 19th July, 1831.

Sir—In an article under the editorial head of your paper of this morning, which has relation to a controversy between the Editor of the Telegraph and yourself, I observe the following remarks:—“At this point, we should have dropped the controversy, but we have understood that it is reported to give continuance to the contradicted statement of the Telegraph that Mr. Berrien has received a letter from Col. Johnson, which shows that we had no warrant for the denial we made as to him.” I take the liberty, therefore, of quoting from the paper of Col. Johnson, which we have, his express declaration, that the President did not make the exaction of the members of his Cabinet, charged by the Telegraph. The Col. says:—

“He (General Jackson) never authorized me to require social intercourse, &c. &c. He always disclaimed it; I told the parties so.” These are the words of the Colonel, to the word, point, and letter. If this does not satisfy, we must refer the parties making a charge, to the witness called by them.”

The reference thus made to me, renders it necessary, that I should submit the following observations to the public, and I have accordingly to ask that you will give them a place in your paper.

I have not authorized the report of which you speak, and I would have told you so, without hesitation, if you had intimated its existence to me. That such a charge would have been more conformable to the views of Col. Johnson, I infer from the following considerations.

I have a letter from that gentleman, in which, after stating his object, and motives, in seeking the interview, which, with the approbation of the President, he held with Messrs. Branch, Ingham and myself, he proceeds to remark that he has not himself seen the necessity, or propriety, of any allusion in newspapers, to this interview, and adds, that if any should consider it necessary, then the great object should be to state the conversation correctly, for which purpose, his views were made known in that letter, in order that any misunderstanding might be corrected.—Acquiescing in the propriety of this suggestion, I immediately communicated to Col. Johnson, a statement of the conversation referred to, as it was very distinctly impressed upon my memory—and sufficient time has not yet elapsed, I believe, to authorize me to expect an answer in the regular course of mail. However this may be, I have not received any. Independently therefore of my reluctance to appear before the public, in relation to any matters connected with the dissolution of the late cabinet, a reluctance which could only be yielded to my own strong conviction of the propriety of such a measure, I have thought that the understanding implied in the correspondence, to which I have referred, would be violated, by publishing a statement of what passed at the interview in question until it could be accompanied by the remarks of Col. Johnson, on that which I had transmitted to him. A departure from this understanding, by that gentleman himself, would of course relieve me from any obligation. But from the tenor of your editorial article, I infer, that the act of publishing the extract from his letter, is not authorized by him. I adhere therefore at present, to the determination, which I had formed; and assuming that your object as public journalists, is to present nothing to your readers which is not the property of the public, as well as to the Editor of the Telegraph, as to yourself, the propriety of abstaining from any partial and imperfect statements of the conversation, which occurred at the interview in question. The delusion produced by such statements, must be speedily corrected; but until that correction is made, their effect is to mislead the public mind, on a subject of awakening interest to the American people.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your obdt servt.
J. N. MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To Francis P. Blair, Esq.
Editor of the Globe.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien

WASHINGTON, JULY 19, 1831.

Sir—I have this moment received your letter, to which I will give immediate publicity. I did not suppose that you had authorized the report, which imposed on me the necessity of giving an extract from Col. Johnson's letter. Under such an impression, I would not have hesitated to call upon you to disown it. The report I knew was false, and was merely circulated to keep in countenance the charge made against the President, until it could work some prejudice against him in the public mind. I did not suppose that you were an accessory in this business, and, therefore, would not insult you by an application which could only be founded on such an inference.

The course I have taken with regard to Col. Johnson's letter, grew out of circumstances which will justify me to him, although he did not authorize me to publish his letter. My sole object was at once to clear the skirts of the President of a charge which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him; for you have, as I understand, explicitly declared that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him.

With regard to conversations between yourself and Col. Johnson, I shall certainly abstain, as I have hitherto abstained, from making “any partial or imperfect statements.” I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
F. P. BLAIR.

Mr. Berrien to Mr. Blair

WASHINGTON, 20th July, 1831.

Sir: Your note of yesterday, was received under circumstances which prevented my immediate attention to it. I reply to it now, to correct the misapprehension into which you have been led, and which, by the publicity which you have given to it, is calculated to mislead the public.

I extract from your note the following sentence:—“My sole object was at once, to clear the skirts of the President from the charge, which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him, for you have, as I understand, explicitly declared, that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him.”

I make this quotation for the purpose of saying to you, that you have been entirely misinformed—that the statement contained in this extract is not warranted by any declaration ever made by me; and still assuming it to be your wish to represent this matter truly to the public, I am under the necessity of asking you to give publicity to this note.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your obdt servt.
J. N. MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To Francis P. Blair, Esq.
Editor of the Globe.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien

WASHINGTON, July 20, 1831.

Sir: Your note of this morning will be given immediately to the press. In reference to the subject of which it treats, you do me but justice when you say

that “I wish to represent this matter truly to the public.” You will permit me, therefore, briefly to show the ground on which I felt myself authorized to say that “you were well aware,” that the charge implicating the President, ought not to be attached to him, and that you had yourself explicitly declared that he disclaimed the purpose imputed to him.

As to the first branch of this statement, which you do not seem directly to controvert, I have to support me the positive written declaration of Col. Johnson, in which he says that the President *always disclaimed* such a requisition, and that he *told you so*. Besides this, I have before me, in the hand writing of the President, the identical paper which he read to yourself, and Messrs. Branch & Ingham, and which presented the attitude that he thought it his duty to assume in relation to the circumstances which affected the harmony and character of his Cabinet. The course which he thought proper to adopt, was predicated on information given him by several members of Congress, shewing that a combination had been entered into, in which yourself and the other gentlemen named were concerned, to disgrace Major Eaton, and coerce his dissolution from the Cabinet. After a prefatory verbal explanation of the reasons inducing the interview, the President proceeded to say, that if it were true that you had taken the course of which he spoke, he felt himself called on to make the declarations which he read to you from his written memorandum, in which he says that it was, using his own words, “Not only unjust in itself, but highly disrespectful to me (the President) and well calculated to destroy the harmony of my cabinet. The grounds upon which this opinion is founded, are substantially these. I do not claim the right to interfere, in any manner, in the domestic relations or personal intercourse of any member of my cabinet, nor have I in any manner attempted it; &c. &c.”

In the conclusion of the same paper, after recapitulating the circumstances to which he wished to call your attention, he says, as the result of the matter, “Therefore have I sought this interview, to assure you if there is any truth in the report that you have entered into the combination charged, to drive Major Eaton from my Cabinet, that I feel it an indignity and insult offered to myself, and is of a character that will be considered.”

This is the ground on which this matter was placed by the President in his interview with you in the beginning of the difficulties. And from it and the absolute avowal of Col. Johnson, I consider my statement, that you were well aware that the President disclaimed all right to interfere and dictate the social intercourse of the family of any member of the cabinet, to be well warranted.

That I am also warranted in having said that you yourself had declared that the President disclaimed to you any disposition of the sort, will appear from the extract which I make from a letter of your own, now before me. After recapitulating a conversation of your own, held with Col. Johnson, (the tenor of which you inform me is to be adjusted between you and him,) you make this single remark in relation to the President:—

“In the interview to which I was invited by the President, some few days afterwards, I frankly exposed to him my views on this subject, and he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition.”

In this you have allusion to the written declaration read to you by the President, which he bears another interpretation than that which you have given it in this extract. In both points presented by me, in the extract quoted in your last note, I feel myself fully sustained by the documentary evidence, which I now lay before you; and I trust you will also consider it as fully vindicating the statement which I have made. Having thus justified myself, you will permit me to conclude my correspondence with you.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
F. P. BLAIR.

Mr. Berrien to Mr. Blair

WASHINGTON, 20th July, 1831.

Sir—I have this moment received your note, in answer to mine of this date. I make no apology for continuing this correspondence, although you intimate a wish to conclude it, because it will be readily understood, that it is in your character as a public journalist, and not as an individual, that I address you. I exercise a right, therefore, which, as the Editor of a public journal, you can with no propriety withhold, when I claim the insertion of this note in the same paper which conveys your own communication to the public. I repeat the quotation from your note of yesterday:—“My sole object was at once to clear the skirts of the President of a charge, which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him; for you have, as I understand, declared that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him.”

The first remark which I have to make upon this quotation, with reference to your observation, that I do not seem to controvert the first branch of this statement, is the following:—Your assertion that *you were well aware*, that the charge against the President, to which you referred, ought not to be attached to him, was made expressly to rest upon your understanding, that I had explicitly declared, that he (the President) disclaimed to me any such design. When, therefore I told you, that your understanding was not correct, I gave you a very broad denial of my having such knowledge as that which you had imputed to me. In more distinct terms, however, (if that be possible,) I now renew that declaration. *I have no such knowledge*. Nay, more, Sir; I have no knowledge of the paper, “in the hand writing of the President,” to which you refer. No such paper was ever read to me, or shown to me, or spoken of to me. If it had been, I should most certainly not now have had occasion to address myself to the public on this subject, through the columns of your paper.

Having thus disposed of the paper to which you refer, and shown that this can furnish no ground for your understanding, of what I was or was not aware of, since *I never saw it, and its contents were never communicated to me*, I advert next to your suggestion, that this understanding is warranted by Col. Johnson's positive avowal. Upon this subject, I have already told the public through you, that I consider myself bound by the implied understanding resulting from my correspondence with that gentleman, not to publish any statement of the conversation which occurred between him, Messrs. Branch and Ingham and myself, until he shall have had a reasonable time to reply to my letter. I told you, at the same time, that any departure from this understanding, which was authorized by that gentleman, would absolve me from his obligation. I still adhere to this view, and content myself, at present, with repeating, in reference to that of which you suppose me to be well aware, that *I have no such knowledge*. The time must speedily arrive when this forbearance will be no longer necessary.

Your next reference is to a letter of mine to Major Eaton, which you say is in your possession. As you have published an extract, you are bound to give the correspondence—even before that is done, it is very easy to see that you have entirely misunderstood the expression which you have quoted—that a disclaimer of an intention to press a requisition, is a wholly different thing, from a denial of ever having made it—and that in using this expression, I could not have had allusion to “a written declaration,” which I had never seen or heard of.

You will perceive then, Sir, that you are wholly unsustained in all the points of your statement, except by

a declaration which you admit that you have used without authority, and which will be met if it becomes necessary. As a faithful journalist, you will, of course, seize the occasion to correct your error; you can, no doubt, do this, in relation to the paper on which you have placed so much reliance, by a direct appeal to the President, who will not, I think, authorize the statement that the paper was ever shown to me. However this may be, I bear testimony to the truth. Neither inviting controversy, nor seeking political effect, I find myself in a position in which I must either speak, or silently permit the public to be misled. I have a sufficient sense of what is due to them, not to intrude myself uncalled upon their notice—and the consciousness of what I owe to myself, will not permit me to shrink from the performance of my duty.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your obedient servant.
JOHN MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To F. P. Blair, Esq. Editor of the Globe.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien

WASHINGTON, July 21st, 1831.

Sir: Your letter was received late at night, when the Globe was made up for the press. To give it insertion with the correspondence which preceded it, rendered it necessary that I should defer the whole until this day, and substitute other matter, previously set up, for my paper.

Without adverting to the special pleading of your letter, (in which, being no lawyer, I have no skill,) I come at once to the point. You take issue again with me, by declaring “that no such paper as that quoted by me was ever read to [you] or shown to you, or spoken of to you.” And you further say, that the President “will not, you think, authorize the statement that that paper was ever shown to [you].”

When the statement which I made, predicated upon Col. Johnson's letter, was impeached in your second note, I made the appeal to the President which you seem to think I ought now to make. He immediately put into my hands the original memorandum which he wrote and which he read to Messrs. Branch, Ingham, and yourself; and I am now expressly authorized to state again, that in the interview referred to in my note and in your own letter, quoted therein, he held in his hand and read to you the paper from which I have given the extracts, which you say was never read, shown or spoken of to you. *And I am authorized further to say, that if you will call on the President, he will again exhibit and read to you this original document.* It was prepared by him in contemplation that the interview might lead to an immediate dissolution of his Cabinet, and it was intended by him to record the basis he assumed in doing an act which involved his own character, and the interests of the country. The paper thus prepared by the President, was communicated at the time to several of his friends, whom he consulted on the occasion. And the substance of the conversation which preceded and followed the communication, was also immediately reduced to writing, and connected with the document read to you, that nothing might be left to recollection, if circumstances at a remote period should make a reference to it necessary. With regard to a transaction so recorded, and vouched by the concurrent testimony of those consulted on the occasion, *there can be no mistake*. A man's memory be treacherous when the man himself is honest. I am willing to believe this is your case. You have innocently forgotten the declaration made by the President, which stands authenticated, as I have told you, as well as the communication of the same paper made to you by Col. Johnson.

I am obliged to rely on this *written record* of a fact rather than on your memory, especially when I find this positive proof confirming the statement of Col. Johnson, that the President disclaimed any right or desire to interfere with the private associations of yourself or your family, and that you knew it.

I next quoted your own written admission, confirming the statement of Col. Johnson, and the written record of the President, in the following words:—“In the interview to which I was invited by the President some few days afterwards, (after Col. Johnson's visit) I frankly expressed to him my views on the subject, and he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition.”

You say that “a disclaimer of an intention to press such a requisition, is a wholly different thing from denial of ever having made it.”

I thought not, in this case; because no such requisition had been made. Col. Johnson says, the President disclaimed to him any desire to control your domestic affairs, or private intercourse, and he told you so. The record of what the President said to you, declares, that he claimed no right to interfere “in the domestic relations or personal intercourse of any member of his cabinet;” and, in allusion to the same conversation, you say, he “disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition.” When no such requisition had been made by Col. Johnson; when he told you the President made none; and when you do not pretend he made any, either directly or indirectly, I could not but understand your declaration, that “he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition,” as a declaration that he made no such requisition.

But I find, in the character you have always sustained before the public, other conclusive proof that no such requisition was ever made of you, and that you knew it. If the President had signified to you, directly or indirectly, that he required you to compel your family to associate with any one, contrary to their will and yours, you would not, as a man of honour, have waited for an invitation to resign. You would have thrown your commission in the face of the President, and said to him, “Sir, I am no longer adviser or associate with a man who requires me to disgrace myself and family, though he be the President of the U. States!” In your public character, I had a guarantee that you would not, for the sake of your honor, salary and emoluments, as Attorney General, sink your character as a man, by tamely listening to such a requisition. No, Sir: it is impossible to believe that you could have listened to such a requisition; dismissed your self respect; forgot your southern honor; and humbly bowed in seeming reverence to the man who had insulted you, until *politely invited to resign!* It is impossible that you could bury such an insult, profess to be the friend of the President, make the speech that you did recently in Georgia, and now that you are out of office, disclose a fact which would seal your own shame. No, Sir; no such proposition was ever made to you; you had no cause to complain of the President; you eulogized him in public and private; and you would have gladly acted as Attorney General to the end of his administration, had you not been invited to resign.

But the circumstances under which the harmony of the late Cabinet was restored, repel the inference, which you will have in your last note, that the extract from your letter to Major Eaton, leaves open in the ambiguity of its expression. From the moment that you denied to the President any participation in the political combination to drive Major Eaton from the Cabinet, the usual courtesies were renewed among its members without any association between their respective families. Major Eaton would have been as reluctant to receive visitors, driven into his doors by the power of the President, as they could possibly have been to submit to much tyranny and degradation. His house was thronged by those who were among the most respectable people of the city—by the most honorable families visiting annually here, and by those from abroad, most distinguished by station. To the gaiety and respectability of parties thus attended, the appearance of per-

sons constrained by the authority of the Executive, if it could have been exerted for such purpose, would have added nothing. It could have served no purpose to have exacted such a requisition as that now imputed, to the injury of the President. To have forced the wife of the Secretary of War, upon that portion of society which was unwilling to receive her, could have added nothing to her reputation. It is ridiculous to impute to the failure of such a design, the dissolution of the late Cabinet. You, I think, must know that this step was the result of the diversity of political views, which attached the two parties in the Cabinet to different divisions of the parties which became apparent in the dissertation between the President and Vice President. This produced, in the then state of the Cabinet, combinations in Congress, calculated to defeat the most salutary measures of the administration. In the opposition which showed itself with regard to the Turkish negotiation, the members of the Cabinet favourable to the new born opposition, were expressly exempted in the denunciations of those members of the Senate, who then came out and disclosed, for the first time, their hostility to the President and a part of his Cabinet. That a wish to bring Maj. Eaton and his family into society here, had no influence in producing the dissolution of the Cabinet, is apparent from the fact that it operated to consign them and him to privacy. The want of the harmony essential to the public welfare, however originated, was pregnant with political effects and produced this result.

You require me to correct the error of my declaration, predicated on the information which Col. Johnson communicated to me, upon the ground that I have no authority to use the evidence which establishes the fact. The testimony which I have in my possession, under Col. Johnson's hand, satisfies me thoroughly of the truth of the assertion I have made, and, therefore, I will not admit it to be an error.—Your exception to the use I have made of this testimony, may be applicable as a censure upon my course. But I consider that circumstances fully justify that course, and I am only responsible to Col. Johnson for my conduct in relation to his letter. Your objection to the authority under which I have acted as to Col. Johnson's evidence, does not in the least, change the nature of that evidence. It is as convincing as it could be under full authority to use it, and probably more so than evidence purposely prepared for the public eye.

You seem to think that I am bound to publish, on my own account, the correspondence between Major Eaton and yourself, because I have used a paragraph having exclusive reference to the President. I do not think so. I will have nothing to do with the controversy between Major Eaton and yourself. You have a right to bring that subject before the public in any way you please, and on your own responsibility. I will not hesitate to print it, or any part you may choose to embody in the discussion with me.

I closed my last note to you, by an intimation that it would conclude our correspondence. I did so because the issue between us depended altogether upon the verity of the statements I had made, contradicting assertions in the Telegraph, for which I did not know that you were responsible. When you volunteered to question my statements, I did before you frankly the ground on which I acted; and then, in a second letter, brought to your view the proof on which, as to myself, I was willing to rest the issue. But as you seem inclined to make, through me, an attack on the President, and to use the correspondence on which you entered (certainly without being called for by anything I said, as to yourself,) as the medium of bringing on a general discussion of the question of the dissolution of the late Cabinet, I shall certainly sacrifice my inclination to what you consider my duty. My reluctance to continue the correspondence with you, proceeds from no want of respect to you. But I believe the public is sick of the subject: is satisfied with the dissolution of the old Cabinet, and the formation of the new one; and this induced the inclination I have evinced, to spare the country the disgust of the dissection of a subject, which it seems willing to bury. At all events, the progress we have made is sufficient for one lecture. If you think fit, we will resume it again. Yours, &c.

F. P. BLAIR.

MR. BERRIEN TO THE PUBLIC.

From the National Intelligencer.

Circumstances beyond my control have placed me under the necessity of presenting myself to your notice. I assert no claim to your attention, which does not belong equally to every free citizen of the Republic. But I ask, and I feel that I have a right to expect, your candid consideration of this address. Its object is one of awakening interest to us all. The position in which I find myself has nothing inviting in it. It is one which I have not sought, but which has been forced upon me, and one in which I am called upon to vindicate not myself merely, but the cause of truth, and the best and dearest interests of the community, at a hazard to which fatuity alone could be insensible.

The misrepresentations of a public journal professing to speak the language of the President of the United States, and published under his eye, have presented to me the alternative, of submitting to an imputation, alike dishonorable and unfounded in fact, or of meeting the issue which has been tendered to me under the alleged authority of that high officer. If I do not shrink from this unequal strife, it is because I have a confidence which has never wavered, in the intelligence of my countrymen, a firm and unshaken reliance in the justice of that tribunal, whose high prerogative it is at all times, and under all circumstances, to vindicate the cause of truth.

I have studiously abstained from any effort to excite public feeling, in relation to the dissolution of the late cabinet. I have felt that the question of its propriety was one, the decision of which belonged alone to the American people. Personally I have not been disposed to deny the right of the President to exercise his own free will, as well in the change, as in the original selection of his cabinet; and with a perfect sense of the delicacy of my own situation, I would have been at all times a reluctant witness in the investigation of the causes which led to the recent events. It was not however enough that I should submit myself to his will, although the principle by which it was avowedly regulated could have no application to me; for this I have unhesitatingly done. But I have been required silently to witness the entire misrepresentation of occurrences which the public were well aware must have come under my observation; nay, to be publicly vouches as authority for that which was in conflict with my convictions of truth—and finally to be called to vindicate my own claim to veracity, assailed as it is under the alleged authority of the President of the United States, or to submit to an imputation which no honorable man may bear. I mistake the character of the American people, if they require this. I am totally ignorant of my own, if, under any circumstances, I could yield to it. If, in the face of this great community, the cause of truth can be prostrated by the arm of power, at least the privilege of vindicating it, shall not be tamely surrendered in my person. I will bow to the decision of my countrymen—but whatever that decision may be, the high consolation of having faithfully discharged my duty to them, and to myself, shall not be taken from me.

The disingenuous and unmanly suggestion of my desire to remain in the cabinet of General Jackson, notwithstanding the occurrences which produced my

retirement, will be my apology for adverting briefly to the origin of my connexion with it, and the circumstances which induced its continuance.

It was without any solicitation on my part, or so far as I know and believe, on the part of any of my friends, that I was invited to accept the office of Attorney General of the United States. There were circumstances, temporary in their nature, but still strongly operative, which rendered it not desirable to me. I felt, however, that I was called to decide upon the question of my acceptance, not merely as an individual, but as a citizen, and especially as a citizen of Georgia. On certain principles of general policy, some of which were particularly interesting to the people of that State, the views communicated to me by the President, were in accordance with my own; and I felt it to be my duty, not to withhold any assistance which I could give to carry them into effect. The announcement of the names of the intended Cabinet seemed to me, however, to present an insuperable bar to my acceptance of the office which was tendered to me. I thought I foresaw clearly the evils which would obviously result from this selection. A stranger to Gen. Jackson, I could not with propriety discuss the objections with him. I knew, moreover, that some of his confidential friends had faithfully discharged their duty to him, and to the country, by a frank communication of them. In this state of things, I sought the counsel of those around me. To a gentleman high in the confidence of the President, and to a distinguished citizen of my own state, I submitted the enquiry, whether, with this view of the Cabinet which the President had selected, I could with propriety become a member of it. The former expressed his decided conviction, founded on a long and intimate knowledge of the President's character, that he would himself speedily see, and correct the evil. The latter urged the peculiar relations of Georgia with the General Government, as presenting a strong claim upon me not to refuse the invitation which had been given to me. I yielded to these suggestions, and took my place in the Cabinet, with a firm determination to avoid the controversies which I feared might occur. To that determination I have steadily adhered. Associating on terms of courtesy with my colleagues, my official intercourse with them was never interrupted by discord.

If there were any combinations growing out of the supposed conflict between the interests of Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Van Buren, I had no part in them—and as little in the supposed measures of that character, having for their object to coerce Major Eaton to retire from the Cabinet—or to exclude his family from the Society of Washington. With mine they did not associate; but no advance had been made on either side, and their actual relation seemed therefore, to furnish no just ground of offence to either party. In this posture of things, and shortly after I had given an evening party to which Mrs. Eaton had not been invited, I received and heard with infinite surprise the message of Col. Johnson.

I could make no mistake as to its character, for there was a direct and repeated reference to the large parties, which had been recently given by Messrs. Branch and Ingham, and myself. Such a mistake, if it had been one, would have been instantly corrected, from the nature of my reply. If the complaint had been of a combination to *evict Major Eaton from office*, and not to *exclude his family from society*, the reference to these evening parties would have been idle; & my declaration that I would not permit the President to control the local intercourse of myself and family, would have been instantly met by an explanation, which would have removed the impression from the minds of Messrs. Branch and Ingham and myself. Yet we all parted with Col. Johnson, with a clear conviction that such a proposition had been made, and feeling as we all did, that an indignity had been offered to us, there was, as I believe, no difference of opinion between us as to the course we ought to pursue, if this proposition should be avowed and pressed by the President.

This conversation took place on Wednesday evening, and the rumor of our intended removal speedily became general. On the succeeding day the personal friends of Gen. Jackson interposed, and he was awakened to a sense of the impropriety of his projected course. It was then, according to Col. Johnson's statement to Mr. Ingham, that the paper spoken of by the Editor of the Globe was prepared. My two colleagues had their interview with the President on the succeeding day, (Friday) and as Mr. Ingham's statement, made from full notes taken at the time, proves, no paper was shown to him on that occasion. Owing to a mistake in the communication of the President's wishes to me, I did not see him until the succeeding day, (Saturday) and then the excitement of his feelings had so entirely subsided that he seemed to me to be anxious to dispose of the subject as briefly as possible. He spoke of the falsehood of the reports against Mrs. Eaton, of which he said he had sufficient proof; and upon my declining to discuss that question, he complained of the injustice of excluding her from society; referred to the large parties given by Messrs. Ingham and Branch, and myself, and told me if he could have been convinced that there was a combination between those gentlemen and myself to exclude her from society, that he would have required our resignations. He immediately added, that he was entirely satisfied that there had been no such combination, and again referred to those large parties, to the rumors to which they had given rise, as having produced that impression. So far from then suggesting that information had been received from any member of Congress, when I claimed the right of having the names of any persons who had made to him representations unfavorable to my conduct, he still referred to the thousand rumors which had reached him, as the origin of such impression which had been made upon his mind. He showed me no paper—spoke to me of none—intimated to me no terms which he would hereafter require. By his declaration that he did not intend to press the requisition which he had made through Col. Johnson, I considered the object of the interview to be to explain to me the motives under which he had acted, and to announce the change of his determination. He accompanied this with expressions of personal kindness, which I thought were intended to soothe the feelings which he must have been conscious of having excited.—Still I thought it was improper for me longer to remain in the Cabinet. Admitting that sufficient atonement had been made for the indignity offered by the message sent through Col. Johnson, there was a perpetual liability to the recurrence of similar outrage.—I believed it, therefore, to be my duty to retire. My friends thought otherwise, and my own sense of what the interests of Georgia at that particular crisis required, induced me to repress my feelings.

When at a subsequent period, the controversy occurred between the President and Vice President, I thought I saw in this, the evidence of an intention again to agitate the question, which by the agency of the personal friends of Gen. Jackson, had been before happily repressed. The connection of Mr. Crawford with this controversy, and my own relation to Gen. Jackson, forbade me to take any part in it—and I studiously avoided all interference, except to deprecate Mr. Calhoun's publication. I left Washington on the fourth day of April, one day after Major Eaton had announced to the President his determination to resign, according to the statement of his (Major Eaton's) letter of resignation, and not the slightest intimation was given to me of the intended change

(See Fourth Page.)