

# NORTH CAROLINA SPECTATOR AND WESTERN ADVERTISER.

VOLUME II.

RUTHERFORDTON, SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 1, 1831.

NUMBER

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY EVENING BY  
ROSSELL ELMER, JR.

Terms of subscription. Two dollars and fifty cents, per annum, if paid in advance; or three dollars, if paid within the year;—but if delayed after the close of the year, twenty-five cents will be added.

No paper will be discontinued until particularly ordered and all arrearages paid, or at the discretion of the publisher.

Advertisements inserted on the usual terms.—All persons advertising will please note the number of times they wish to have them inserted, or they will be continued and taxed accordingly.

## DR. O. P. MILLS,

HAVING located himself at Rutherfordton, tenders his professional services to the citizens of the village and its vicinity.

He would add, that having had considerable experience in private as well as public practice, he hopes to receive a liberal share of patronage.

His office will be kept in a front room of R. G. TWITTY'S HOTEL. OTIS P. MILLS.  
Rutherfordton, June 4, 1831.

## HOUSE, SHOP & LOT FOR SALE.

THE subscriber offers for sale his House, Shop and Lot, in the town of Rutherfordton, situate two lots north of Wm. Twitty's Hotel,—which he offers on the most advantageous terms.  
MAURICE MC CARTHY.  
June 11, 1831. 174

## MORE MONEY!!!

CASH will be paid, whenever the work is completed, for the building of an amendment on the Hickory-nut road, at the Stone Bridge or Half Ford, near Mr. Dobson Freeman's. It will be let, in one, two or three parcels, as may best suit undertakers, and will be shown to such as wish to undertake by Mr. Freeman. It is desirable that it be undertaken and executed as soon as possible; we therefore advise such as want the money to apply immediately. T. F. BIRCHETT, Com'rs  
JAS. GRAHAM, }  
July 29, 1831. 244

## State of North Carolina,

Rutherford County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions—July Session 1831.

James Breedlove } Original Attachment,  
vs. Benjamin Magness, } levied on lands.

Appearing to the Court that the defendant in this cause is not an inhabitant of this State—it is ordered, that he appear before the Justices of the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, at the next Court to be holden for the county of Rutherford, at the Court House, at Rutherfordton, on the 4th Monday after the 4th Monday of September next,—give bond and security, and plead to issue, or judgment by default will be entered against him, and the lands attached condemned for the payment of plaintiff's demand.

It is further ordered that, publication of this order be made, for six successive weeks, in the North Carolina Spectator and Western Advertiser.

Teste, T. F. BIRCHETT, Clerk.  
August 13, 1831. Pr. adv. \$2.50 26 6

## Look at this!

THE compass has been so long in use, that I hope its utility will ere long find its way into Rutherford county, and put every man in possession of his own land marks,—they may then escape the judgment denounced in a certain book.

This is therefore, to notify all persons, (that they may not plead ignorance in future,) that I am determined to prosecute all and every individual, who shall be found trespassing by cultivating the soil, removing timber, or in any otherwise committing waste upon any of the various tracts of land belonging to Col. RICHARD LEWIS, situate in the Rutherford county—lots and land adjoining the village of Rutherfordton, unless with my written or verbal consent; and it is presumed that all leases and permissions granted by him, for any of those purposes, have expired.

Persons holding bonds on him for titles, would do well to present them.—Also persons having made purchases of land, in which he is interested, are hereby notified that no titles will be executed, unless satisfactory evidence is adduced, that his proportion of the purchase money has been actually paid, or secured to be paid, either to himself or his properly authorized agent.

J. OVERTON LEWIS, Agent.  
Rutherfordton, 25th Jan'y, 1831. 59 1y p

## State of North Carolina,

Haywood County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions—June Term, 1831.

Polly Gambell } Petition for Dower.  
vs. John Gambell }

IN this case, it appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that the defendant, John Gambell, is not an inhabitant of this State—it is therefore ordered by the Court, that publication be made for three months, in the North Carolina Spectator and Western Advertiser, for the defendant, John Gambell, to appear at a County Court, at the Court house in Waynesville, on the last Monday in December next, then and there to plead, answer, or demur to the petition;—otherwise the several matters and things therein set forth, will be taken for confessed, and decreed accordingly.

Witness, Robert Love, Clerk of our said Court, at office, the last Monday of June 1831, and in the 54th year of American Independence.  
ROBERT LOVE, C. H. C. C.

## FARM & GOLD-MINE, FOR SALE.

THE subscriber offers to sell his Farm, containing 88 acres, situate on the waters of Alston's creek, which empties into Green river. On said farm is a Gold Mine, which as far as has been tested has proved to be rich and valuable. The same will be sold at private sale, for cash; and the purchaser may secure a bargain by examining and purchasing it.

## —ALSO, FOR SALE—

TWO NEW STILLS;

ONE SET OF MILL-STONES.  
HAMPTON THOMPSON.  
80 5wp  
White Oak, Rutherford co., Sept. 3, 1831.

## POLITICAL.

### MR. CRAWFORD'S ADDRESS.

To the Citizens of the United States.  
(Concluded.)

I proceed now to comment on Mr. Calhoun's note, to my letter of the 2d October 1830. It is, however, due to myself, to state, that that letter was written without any expectation that it would be published. I am, however, glad, that it was published, and that it has been accompanied with notes, by the Vice President.

Those notes establish two most important facts. 1st. That John C. Calhoun established the Washington Republican for the purpose of vilifying my reputation; and 2nd. That he was the instigator and inventor of the charges of Ninian Edwards, against my official and private character.

The evidence by which these charges are established, would be received in any court of justice in the civilized world, and is tenfold stronger than that which he has deemed admissible against me. It is a rule of evidence of every day's application in our courts, that where the parties to a suit are together, and one alleges a fact touching their law suit in the presence and hearing of the other, which is not denied by the other, it is good evidence against the party not denying it. My letter to the Vice-President, of the 2d Oct. 1830, was answered by him, on the 30th of that month. That letter, was therefore, in his hands from the 30th Oct., until the 25th of February, when he annexes a parcel of Notes to it, in the Telegraph. I shall, in the sequel, state the evidence upon which those notes are ascribed to the Vice-President. They are such, that he at least, will be constrained to admit. In my letter to the Vice-President, of the 2d October, 1830, I charge him with having established the Washington Republican, for the purpose of vilifying my reputation, and that it was edited by a clerk in his office. In one of his notes, he denies that Thomas L. McKenney, the editor of that press, was a clerk in the War Department, while he was Editor of that paper. He asserts that McKenney sold out his interest in that paper in 1823, and was not appointed clerk in the War Department until February 1824. The Vice-President then admits that he did establish that Press for the purpose of vilifying my reputation.—I have not the means of ascertaining whether the facts be correctly stated. But, for the sake of argument, let it be admitted. How does that benefit the Vice-President? Had McKenney been appointed a clerk before he became Editor, or even while he was, Mr. Calhoun would in all probability, have alleged, that any interference by the Secretary, to prevent the abuse which was heaped upon me, by that Press, would have been an infringement of the liberty of the Press. But if the appointment was made, after he ceased his editorial labors, it was apparently made to remunerate the services he had rendered by abusing me. In my letter of the 2d Oct., I informed Mr. Calhoun, that he had been charged in a Charleston paper, with being concerned with the Ninian Edwards conspiracy, to destroy my reputation; and charged him with having excited Edwards to the act, and with revising the charges, and state what General Noble informed me, of his (Calhoun's) daily visits to Edwards, for eight or ten days before he set out for the West. No part of this charge is denied in the notes. The whole charge is therefore admitted. In the Vice-President's elaborate letter of the 29th of May, 1830, to the President, speaking of the Nashville letter, he says, "He (Mr. Crawford) offers no reason for charging me with so dishonorable an act, as that of betraying the proceedings of the cabinet, and that for the purpose of injuring one of my associates in the administration." He adds a few lines further: "But why charge me, and not Mr. Adams?" In my letter of the 2d October last, to the Vice-President, is stated, "I copy a question from your letter of the 29th of May, 1830, thus expressed: you ask, why not charge Mr. Adams with having written it?" "My reply is that the answer is conclusive. That letter contained two falsehoods, one intended to injure me, the other to benefit you, (John C. Calhoun,) and that which was for (John C. Calhoun's) benefit, taking from Mr. Adams half the credit of defending General Jackson, and giving it to you (John C. Calhoun.) Admitting for the sake of argument, that Mr. Adams was disposed to injure me, no one will, I think, suppose that he would voluntarily ascribe to you half the merit of his own actions to the man who was the most strenuous opposer of his wishes. If the intrinsic evidence of the letter, fixes it upon you (Mr. Calhoun,) and not upon Mr. Adams, subsequent events strongly corroborate the evidence deducible from the published letter." To the foregoing, reasoning, no objection is taken in the notes. The reasoning is,

therefore, admitted to be legitimate and sound.—But it may possibly be urged by the Vice-President, that this is carrying the principle of admission too far. This would be admitted if Mr. Calhoun had confined his notes to facts; and had not extended them to reasoning. In my letter to the Vice-President, of the 2d Oct. last, I state, "you say that the decision of the Cabinet was unanimously agreed to. This, I believe, to be untrue, and I believe you knew it to be untrue, at the time you wrote it. My reasons are the following: The Cabinet deliberations commenced on Tuesday morning, and on Friday evening, I thought all the questions had been decided, and Mr. Adams was directed to draft a note to the Spanish Minister, conformably to those decisions. I intended to set off for Georgia on Sunday morning, and in order to prepare the department for my absence, I was busily employed in office, when about 1 or 2 o'clock, I received a note from the President requesting my attendance. When I entered, the greatest part of Mr. Adams' note had been rejected, and the remainder was shortly after, because it was written not in conformity to the decisions which had been made by the Cabinet, but expressly contrary to them. He was then again directed to write the note, conformably to the decisions. This was late on Saturday evening. The next morning, I set off for Georgia." Mr. Adams' letter of the 25th of July, 1830, now before me, reiterates all the arguments he urged at the Cabinet, and in it he informs me, "That the exposition which appeared in the Intelligencer, was not written by him." From all these facts, I think it is fairly inferable that Mr. Adams did not agree, to the decision of the cabinet, and that you must have known it; for it is certain that he did not agree to it on Saturday, and it is highly improbable that any argument should have been urged to convince him after he had been twice directed, to draft his note in conformity to decisions which had been previously made." To this train of reasoning, the Vice-President appends the following note: "This appears to be a non sequitur. The decision may have been unanimous, and a new note necessary, because the note did not agree with it." I am perfectly willing that the intelligent reader should decide the question of logic, between us, by adding a single observation; that in the ordinary routine it was the duty of the Secretary of State, to have drawn the exposition which appeared in the Intelligencer, and that he would have done it, is highly probable, but from his having dissented from the principles it contained. In the foregoing note, the Vice-President evidently objects to the argument presented in my letter. If he excepts to the argument in this case, he was more strongly bound to except to that which tended to fix upon him, the writing of the Nashville letter, if it was illogical and unsound, especially as it was presented in compliance with his express demand, contained in his letter of the 29th of May, 1830. By his objecting to the correctness of the argument, in one case, and waiving any objection to that furnished at his request, he must be considered as having acquiesced in the correctness, and legitimacy, and soundness of the conclusion, that he is the author of the Nashville letter.

I will, now, explain the reason why I consider the Vice-President the author of the notes appended to my letter in the Telegraph. In this elaborate letter of the 29th of May, he says, "He, Mr. Crawford, was at Milledgeville, on the 16th of August; a few days after he passed through Augusta, and a little after, there appeared a statement in the Journal, somewhat varied from that made in Edgefield, but agreeing with it in most of the particulars. I cannot lay my hand on the article, but have a distinct recollection of it. You no doubt remember it; circumstances fixed it upon Mr. Crawford, and it has not to my knowledge been denied." Here it is seen that Mr. Calhoun relies upon my silence as evidence of guilt; as evidence that I had communicated cabinet secrets to the Editor of the Georgia Journal, although he does not pretend, that the statement in the Georgia Journal was charged upon me, by that Journal, and does not state any of the circumstances that he says fixed it upon me. When it is presumed, that he had Clark's pamphlet before him, and which, though written by the most vindictive and malignant being that ever existed; admits that the Editor of the Georgia Journal, formerly denied it, in the following paragraph. "It may be proper to state, that we did not, as has been erroneously supposed, derive our information, from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, respecting the reported division of the cabinet, on the propriety of arresting General Jackson, for his late

conduct." I never suspected, that I had been charged with any connection with the statement, in the Georgia Journal, until some time in October of the year 1830, when a pamphlet published by John Clark then Governor of Georgia, fell into my hands, which contained the charges accompanied by the evidence of the charge, which, the Governor had been able to collect, but the evidence was of a nature so ridiculous, that none but the author would have made the charge. The same Wilson Lumpkin, who figures in the correspondence and address of the Vice-President, informed me that Governor Clark had sent the charge and the evidence to General Jackson, to be by him laid before the President. It is presumed that Mr. Calhoun was conscious of this fact, as he tells the President in his letter of the 29th May, 1830. "You no doubt remember it." I was never informed by Mr. Monroe, whether the charge was submitted to him. But he informed the Senators from Pennsylvania, that the General had urged my removal, from the Cabinet, and they communicated it to me, the same day. The pamphlet just referred to, obtained no currency. I do not recollect to have seen a single reference to it in any newspaper, not even in the Washington Republican, although the pamphlet was published expressly to affect the Presidential election. It was so ridiculous and malignant, that even Mr. Calhoun's Press, the Washington Republican, which teemed with daily abuse of me, thought it prudent not to use it. Yet it is a charge contained in such a pamphlet, and under such circumstances, that the Vice-President considers it evidence against me, because I had not denied it.

A number of the Globe, dated in the latter end of February last, contains notes explanatory of the notes appended to my letter of the 2d October, 1830, by the Vice-President, which is headed by the following remark. "The Editor of the Telegraph has published Mr. Crawford's letter to Mr. Calhoun, patched all over with the notes of his antagonist.—It is but fair to give the explanatory notes, given by a friend of Mr. Crawford." Here the charge is direct and positive. The Vice-President was in the city, and must be presumed to have seen the charge.—His silence, therefore, is evidence that he was the author of the notes. It is, at least, evidence to which he cannot object; for it is tenfold stronger than that which he has urged against me. This remark has already been published in a variety of papers, and must, therefore, have reached him through a variety of channels. He has contradicted none of them, and must be presumed to have acquiesced in the truth of the charge. Besides, no one can believe that Mr. Calhoun would have confined the task of writing the notes to any other person. In his letter of the 31st Oct. last, returning mine, it is seen that he intended to use that letter against me. I have never, before the appearance of Mr. Calhoun's several publications, understood and felt the force and intensity of that exclamation of the Patriarch Job, "Oh that mine adversary had written a book!"

Mine has written two books and one set of notes, by which he is convicted by legal evidence, 1st. Of having written, or caused to be written, the Nashville letter, which in his letter of 29th of May, 1830, he asserts never to have seen. 2d. Of having set up the Washington Republican, for the purpose of vilifying my reputation. 3d. Of having conspired with Ninian Edwards, to destroy my official & private character. In his letter last referred to, the Vice-President pronounces, "That it would have been dishonorable for him to have written the Nashville letter to injure one of his associates in the administration." No rational being will, I think, dissent from this sentence. But he is by his notes, convicted of this dishonorable act. Now, it is respectfully submitted to the decision of enlightened readers of this review, whether it is more dishonorable to have written that letter, which contains but one falsehood, to the injury of that associate, than to have established a press, for vilifying the reputation of the same associate, which teemed with daily falsehoods upon that associate.

The Vice President affects much patriotism and great veneration for the fundamental institutions of the United States. There is none of those institutions more vital than the liberty of the press. That liberty can never be impaired in the United States, but by its licentiousness. It is firmly believed, that no press established in the Union, carried the licentiousness of the press to such extremes as the Washington Republican, not even excepting the notorious Peter Forepaugh. The Vice-President is, therefore, an enemy to the liberty of the press.—Again it is respectfully submitted to the community, to decide, whether it was more dishonorable to

have written the Nashville letter to injure one of his associates in the administration, than to have established a press, for vilifying the reputation of the same associate, which teemed with daily falsehoods upon that associate.

Does he mean that I would do an act of injustice or personal injury? If he means this he is wrong. There is not a human being in the world to whom I would do a personal injury, or an act of injustice. But if he means I am not friendly to his further promotion, he is right. I know his radical unworthiness, and could not conscientiously aid his further elevation to office. If I were to do it, I should render myself the accomplice of the injury which it might and probably would inflict upon the community.

As the Vice President in his notes to my letter insists upon Mr. M'Duffie's evidence, and that evidence is the foundation of almost all his reasoning and of almost all the inferences drawn in his elaborate letter of the 30th of May, 1830, it is proper at once for me to say there is no truth in any part of Mr. M'Duffie's statement, except that I passed through the village of Edgefield, in the summer of 1818, and was at the house of Col. Simpkins. Every thing beyond that, in Mr. M'Duffie's statement, is the fiction of his brain, (see Judge Moore's letter.) After reading that letter,

LEXINGTON, June, 1831.  
\*Dear Sir—In answer to the inquiries you made of me the other day, I beg leave to state.—The conduct of General Jackson in the Seminole war of 1818, produced as great feeling in our little town as it did in any other part of our State. You had written on to Thomas W. Cobb, Esq. one of our Representatives in Congress, and who then resided in Lexington, that you would leave Washington for Georgia as soon as a Cabinet meeting should adjourn, which would be held to make some inquiry into this matter. Your arrival in Lexington was looked for with great anxiety, and I remember the day you did arrive, that Mr. Cobb and Dr. D. Dunn, now of Tennessee, were at my house at the time you were expected in that day's stage, no other person was present except those gentlemen and myself. This was the last of July of that year, You had hardly seated yourself before Mr. Cobb started the subject of the Cabinet meeting. All who recollect Mr. Cobb, will readily remember his anxiety upon all political subjects, and particularly on this his great feeling on the subject, and feeling much myself along with most of our citizens, the conversation which then took place made a very strong impression on my mind. It is not necessary to detail all of the conversation that I recollect, as it would fill several pages. After having satisfied several enquiries put to you by Mr. Cobb, relative to the proceeding of the meeting, he at last put some question to you, which you refused to give a direct answer to, and then asked him if he had seen the National Intelligencer of a particular date. He said he had not. You then observed to him, that he would find in that paper all that the Administration thought proper to make public. The conversation was kept up for several hours during which you several times referred Mr. Cobb to the statement in the Intelligencer, as he seemed to press his enquiries upon you further than you were disposed to answer. During the conversation, Mr. Cobb informed you that he considered the conduct of General Jackson, as very improper, and that it ought not to be allowed to pass over without being more noticed, and as the Cabinet had not censured him, and as no further enquiry into his conduct on their part would likely take place, he was determined to bring the matter before Congress at the next session: such a precedent, he observed, would be a dangerous one to pass without enquiry or censure. You used several arguments to convince him that he would fail in his object, if it was brought before Congress. You remarked that the Nation would support Gen. Jackson in the course he had pursued in carrying on this war; that public feeling was with him, in every State, except Georgia; that the Administration would give him their support; and that being supported by the Nation and the Administration, you were convinced Congress would not censure his conduct. Your arguments did not convince Mr. Cobb, as he still persisted in saying, that he should bring it before Congress. I distinctly recollect that you and Mr. Cobb differed in opinion upon several

have written the Nashville letter to injure one of his associates in the administration, than to have established a press, for vilifying the reputation of the same associate, which teemed with daily falsehoods upon that associate.

Does he mean that I would do an act of injustice or personal injury? If he means this he is wrong. There is not a human being in the world to whom I would do a personal injury, or an act of injustice. But if he means I am not friendly to his further promotion, he is right. I know his radical unworthiness, and could not conscientiously aid his further elevation to office. If I were to do it, I should render myself the accomplice of the injury which it might and probably would inflict upon the community.

As the Vice President in his notes to my letter insists upon Mr. M'Duffie's evidence, and that evidence is the foundation of almost all his reasoning and of almost all the inferences drawn in his elaborate letter of the 30th of May, 1830, it is proper at once for me to say there is no truth in any part of Mr. M'Duffie's statement, except that I passed through the village of Edgefield, in the summer of 1818, and was at the house of Col. Simpkins. Every thing beyond that, in Mr. M'Duffie's statement, is the fiction of his brain, (see Judge Moore's letter.) After reading that letter,

LEXINGTON, June, 1831.  
\*Dear Sir—In answer to the inquiries you made of me the other day, I beg leave to state.—The conduct of General Jackson in the Seminole war of 1818, produced as great feeling in our little town as it did in any other part of our State. You had written on to Thomas W. Cobb, Esq. one of our Representatives in Congress, and who then resided in Lexington, that you would leave Washington for Georgia as soon as a Cabinet meeting should adjourn, which would be held to make some inquiry into this matter. Your arrival in Lexington was looked for with great anxiety, and I remember the day you did arrive, that Mr. Cobb and Dr. D. Dunn, now of Tennessee, were at my house at the time you were expected in that day's stage, no other person was present except those gentlemen and myself. This was the last of July of that year, You had hardly seated yourself before Mr. Cobb started the subject of the Cabinet meeting. All who recollect Mr. Cobb, will readily remember his anxiety upon all political subjects, and particularly on this his great feeling on the subject, and feeling much myself along with most of our citizens, the conversation which then took place made a very strong impression on my mind. It is not necessary to detail all of the conversation that I recollect, as it would fill several pages. After having satisfied several enquiries put to you by Mr. Cobb, relative to the proceeding of the meeting, he at last put some question to you, which you refused to give a direct answer to, and then asked him if he had seen the National Intelligencer of a particular date. He said he had not. You then observed to him, that he would find in that paper all that the Administration thought proper to make public. The conversation was kept up for several hours during which you several times referred Mr. Cobb to the statement in the Intelligencer, as he seemed to press his enquiries upon you further than you were disposed to answer. During the conversation, Mr. Cobb informed you that he considered the conduct of General Jackson, as very improper, and that it ought not to be allowed to pass over without being more noticed, and as the Cabinet had not censured him, and as no further enquiry into his conduct on their part would likely take place, he was determined to bring the matter before Congress at the next session: such a precedent, he observed, would be a dangerous one to pass without enquiry or censure. You used several arguments to convince him that he would fail in his object, if it was brought before Congress. You remarked that the Nation would support Gen. Jackson in the course he had pursued in carrying on this war; that public feeling was with him, in every State, except Georgia; that the Administration would give him their support; and that being supported by the Nation and the Administration, you were convinced Congress would not censure his conduct. Your arguments did not convince Mr. Cobb, as he still persisted in saying, that he should bring it before Congress. I distinctly recollect that you and Mr. Cobb differed in opinion upon several

have written the Nashville letter to injure one of his associates in the administration, than to have established a press, for vilifying the reputation of the same associate, which teemed with daily falsehoods upon that associate.

Does he mean that I would do an act of injustice or personal injury? If he means this he is wrong. There is not a human being in the world to whom I would do a personal injury, or an act of injustice. But if he means I am not friendly to his further promotion, he is right. I know his radical unworthiness, and could not conscientiously aid his further elevation to office. If I were to do it, I should render myself the accomplice of the injury which it might and probably would inflict upon the community.

As the Vice President in his notes to my letter insists upon Mr. M'Duffie's evidence, and that evidence is the foundation of almost all his reasoning and of almost all the inferences drawn in his elaborate letter of the 30th of May, 1830, it is proper at once for me to say there is no truth in any part of Mr. M'Duffie's statement, except that I passed through the village of Edgefield, in the summer of 1818, and was at the house of Col. Simpkins. Every thing beyond that, in Mr. M'Duffie's statement, is the fiction of his brain, (see Judge Moore's letter.) After reading that letter,

LEXINGTON, June, 1831.  
\*Dear Sir—In answer to the inquiries you made of me the other day, I beg leave to state.—The conduct of General Jackson in the Seminole war of 1818, produced as great feeling in our little town as it did in any other part of our State. You had written on to Thomas W. Cobb, Esq. one of our Representatives in Congress, and who then resided in Lexington, that you would leave Washington for Georgia as soon as a Cabinet meeting should adjourn, which would be held to make some inquiry into this matter. Your arrival in Lexington was looked for with great anxiety, and I remember the day you did arrive, that Mr. Cobb and Dr. D. Dunn, now of Tennessee, were at my house at the time you were expected in that day's stage, no other person was present except those gentlemen and myself. This was the last of July of that year, You had hardly seated yourself before Mr. Cobb started the subject of the Cabinet meeting. All who recollect Mr. Cobb, will readily remember his anxiety upon all political subjects, and particularly on this his great feeling on the subject, and feeling much myself along with most of our citizens, the conversation which then took place made a very strong impression on my mind. It is not necessary to detail all of the conversation that I recollect, as it would fill several pages. After having satisfied several enquiries put to you by Mr. Cobb, relative to the proceeding of the meeting, he at last put some question to you, which you refused to give a direct answer to, and then asked him if he had seen the National Intelligencer of a particular date. He said he had not. You then observed to him, that he would find in that paper all that the Administration thought proper to make public. The conversation was kept up for several hours during which you several times referred Mr. Cobb to the statement in the Intelligencer, as he seemed to press his enquiries upon you further than you were disposed to answer. During the conversation, Mr. Cobb informed you that he considered the conduct of General Jackson, as very improper, and that it ought not to be allowed to pass over without being more noticed, and as the Cabinet had not censured him, and as no further enquiry into his conduct on their part would likely take place, he was determined to bring the matter before Congress at the next session: such a precedent, he observed, would be a dangerous one to pass without enquiry or censure. You used several arguments to convince him that he would fail in his object, if it was brought before Congress. You remarked that the Nation would support Gen. Jackson in the course he had pursued in carrying on this war; that public feeling was with him, in every State, except Georgia; that the Administration would give him their support; and that being supported by the Nation and the Administration, you were convinced Congress would not censure his conduct. Your arguments did not convince Mr. Cobb, as he still persisted in saying, that he should bring it before Congress. I distinctly recollect that you and Mr. Cobb differed in opinion upon several

have written the Nashville letter to injure one of his associates in the administration, than to have established a press, for vilifying the reputation of the same associate, which teemed with daily falsehoods upon that associate.

Does he mean that I would do an act of injustice or personal injury? If he means this he is wrong. There is not a human being in the world to whom I would do a personal injury, or an act of injustice. But if he means I am not friendly to his further promotion, he is right. I know his radical unworthiness, and could not conscientiously aid his further elevation to office. If I were to do it, I should render myself the accomplice of the injury which it might and probably would inflict upon the community.

As the Vice President in his notes to my letter insists upon Mr. M'Duffie's evidence, and that evidence is the foundation of almost all his reasoning and of almost all the inferences drawn in his elaborate letter of the 30th of May, 1830, it is proper at once for me to say there is no truth in any part of Mr. M'Duffie's statement, except that I passed through the village of Edgefield, in the summer of 1818, and was at the house of Col. Simpkins. Every thing beyond that, in Mr. M'Duffie's statement, is the fiction of his brain, (see Judge Moore's letter.) After reading that letter,

LEXINGTON, June, 1831.  
\*Dear Sir—In answer to the inquiries you made of me the other day, I beg leave to state.—The conduct of General Jackson in the Seminole war of 1818, produced as great feeling in our little town as it did in any other part of our State. You had written on to Thomas W. Cobb, Esq. one of our Representatives in Congress, and who then resided in Lexington, that you would leave Washington for Georgia as soon as a Cabinet meeting should adjourn, which would be held to make some inquiry into this matter. Your arrival in Lexington was looked for with great anxiety, and I remember the day you did arrive, that Mr. Cobb and Dr. D. Dunn, now of Tennessee, were at my house at the time you were expected in that day's stage, no other person was present except those gentlemen and myself. This was the last of July of that year, You had hardly seated yourself before Mr. Cobb started the subject of the Cabinet meeting. All who recollect Mr. Cobb, will readily remember his anxiety upon all political subjects, and particularly on this his great feeling on the subject, and feeling much myself along with most of our citizens, the conversation which then took place made a very strong impression on my mind. It is not necessary to detail all of the conversation that I recollect, as it would fill several pages. After having satisfied several enquiries put to you by Mr. Cobb, relative to the proceeding of the meeting, he at last put some question to you, which you refused to give a direct answer to, and then asked him if he had seen the National Intelligencer of a particular date. He said he had not. You then observed to him, that he would find in that paper all that the Administration thought proper to make public. The conversation was kept up for several hours during which you several times referred Mr. Cobb to the statement in the Intelligencer, as he seemed to press his enquiries upon you further than you were disposed to answer. During the conversation, Mr. Cobb informed you that he considered the conduct of General Jackson, as very improper, and that it ought not to be allowed to pass over without being more noticed, and as the Cabinet had not censured him, and as no further enquiry into his conduct on their part would likely take place, he was determined to bring the matter before Congress at the next session: such a precedent, he observed, would be a dangerous one to pass without enquiry or censure. You used several arguments to convince him that he would fail in his object, if it was brought before Congress. You remarked that the Nation would support Gen. Jackson in the course he had pursued in carrying on this war; that public feeling was with him, in every State, except Georgia; that the Administration would give him their support; and that being supported by the Nation and the Administration, you were convinced Congress would not censure his conduct. Your arguments did not convince Mr. Cobb, as he still persisted in saying, that he should bring it before Congress. I distinctly recollect that you and Mr. Cobb differed in opinion upon several