

of Messrs. Jefferson and Hamilton on the first bank bill ever see the light? How were the facts and circumstances which preceded and accompanied the removal of Edmund Randolph from the State Department, by General Washington, disclosed and made known to the public? If your assertion be true, those facts and circumstances would, at this moment, be buried in Egyptian darkness. While a Cabinet is in existence and its usefulness liable to be impaired, reason and common sense point out the propriety of keeping its proceedings secret. But after the Cabinet is longer sitting, when its usefulness cannot be impaired by a disclosure of its proceedings, neither reason, common sense, nor patriotism, requires that those proceedings should be shrouded in impenetrable darkness. The acts of such a Cabinet become history, and the Nation has the same right to a knowledge of them, that it has to any other historical fact. It is presumed that all nations have entertained this opinion and have acted upon it. Hence the secret history of Cabinets, the most despotic in Europe. Hence the history of the house of Stuart, by Charles James Fox, which discloses the most secret intercourse between Charles II. and the French Ministers, by which it was proven that Charles was a pensioner of Louis the XIV, the King of France, and had secretly agreed to re-establish Popery in England. Yet in the face of all these facts, you dare to presume upon the ignorance of the distinguished person you were addressing, so far as to insinuate that such disclosures had never been made in any country, but certainly not in this Republic.

The next thing which I shall observe is, the manner in which you attempt to obtain evidence to controvert my statement to Mr. Forsyth. That statement contained one prominent and distinct fact; every thing else in that statement was secondary and collateral to that fact. It was reasonable, in controverting that statement, that you should have sought to obtain evidence to controvert that fact. You apply to Mr. Monroe and Mr. Wirt for evidence. But of what? Not of the principal fact, but of a secondary collateral matter. The omission to appeal to Mr. Monroe whether you made the proposition assigned to you in my letter to Mr. Forsyth, is a strong presumptive evidence that you believed his answer would confirm my statement. You remember the excitement which your proposition produced in the mind and upon the feelings of the President, and did not dare to ask him any question tending to revive his recollection of that proposition. The different manner in which you approach the President and Mr. Wirt, even upon the collateral secondary fact upon which you do venture to interrogate them, proceeds from the same fact that made you avoid interrogating them upon the principal fact. When you make the enquiry of Mr. Wirt as to whether you made the proposition assigned to you in my letter to Mr. Forsyth, you are in search of evidence to confirm my statement that extract would not tend to refresh his memory or relied implicitly upon Mr. Wirt's disposition to give such evidence as you desired from him. But you were apprehensive that the same extract sent to Mr. Monroe might refresh his memory, and enable him to give such an answer as would not suit your views. The extract of my letter sent to Mr. Wirt described facts and circumstances in which Mr. Monroe was a principal actor. It was therefore deemed unsafe to submit them to him. The excitement produced upon the President was so manifest, that you did not believe it could have escaped the attention of Mr. Wirt; you therefore believed it unsafe to interrogate him as to your proposition personally affecting Gen. Jackson. Mr. Monroe says not a word tending to show that the confidential letter was not produced and read in the Cabinet which was not suggested by Mr. Wirt. Every tyro in the science of law will tell you, that it is a rule of evidence that one affirmative witness outweighs many negatives; but although you were at the bar several years, it is possible your law learning never ascended so high. I might safely rest the case here; but I will produce one affirmative witness in support of the accuracy of my statement, opposed as it is by Mr. Wirt's negative statement. The Hon. Benjamin W. Crowninshield, in a letter dated 25th July, 1830, says: "You ask if I recollect, while in the councils of the Cabinet, of a letter written by General Jackson to President Monroe? I do recollect of a conversation about a private letter which Mr. Calhoun, I believe, asked for, and the President said he had not got it, but upon examination found he had it. This letter contained information and opinions respecting Spain and her colonies, the Floridas; but the particulars I cannot now undertake to say or state correctly. I remember, I think, your stating that the circumstances then spoken of did fully explain Gen. Jackson's conduct during the campaign. I remember, too, that Mr. Calhoun was severe upon the conduct of the General, but the words particularly spoken have slipped my recollection. Now, sir, what do you think of the negative statement of Mr. Wirt? Do you think it now so very certain that that letter was not produced and read in the Cabinet upon which your memory is so distinct? Do you not, on the contrary, feel convinced of having attempted to pass off a falsehood upon the President of the United States?"

The main fact contained in my statement is not denied, directly or indirectly, in your elaborate essay; but a negative is attempted by argument. And what kind of argument is offered? Why, that it would be to take his (your) understanding very low, to suppose that an officer under our laws could be punished without arrest and trial. "Sir, I rate any man's understanding very low, who acts with a total disregard to principle. It is true that in addition to the argument, you add, that to say you did not propose to arrest General Jackson, but that he should be punished or reprimanded in some form or other, is absurd on its face. What need is there for arrest and trial, preparatory to reprimand? But it is indeed true that a military officer cannot be punished without a trial? Was not the disapprobation in the case of the Seminole war a punishment? I think General Jackson must have felt it to be such. I should have opened it, if I had seen any way of placing the Government in the right as to Spain, without disavowing the principal events of the Seminole war.

If you are not satisfied with the evidence of Mr. Crowninshield, Mr. Adams, in a letter dated 30th July, 1830, says: "The main point upon which it was urged that Gen. Jackson should be brought to trial was, that he had violated his orders by taking St. Marks and Pensacola." It is true that Mr. Adams does not say by whom it was urged to bring Gen. Jackson to trial; but you know well that there was no proposition made in the Cabinet affecting Gen. Jackson personally, but what was made by yourself. If you deny this, I will obtain the necessary explanation from Mr. Adams. It may be proper to state, that the two letters from Messrs. Adams and Crowninshield are the only communications I have received from them since my departure from Washington, and they are in reply to the only letter I have written to them since my aforesaid period. There has been as the sympathy, either individual or political, between these gentlemen and me,

as between them and you; and, in fact, much less between Mr. Adams and myself than between him and you, at least before the coalition between him and Clay. In fact, before that event, my impression was, that from the time your name was put down for the Presidency you favored the cause of Mr. Adams. And the fact that all his electors voted for you as Vice President, and that you suffered his printer to become proprietor of the press you had established in Washington for the express purpose of vilifying my character, and lauding yours, without stipulating that it should not be wielded against General Jackson, go far to establish the fact. I have now done with your argumentative denial, and the negative evidence of Mr. Wirt, backed by your distinct recollection.

I shall now take some notice of your attacks upon me, which, with the exception of Mr. McDuffie's letter, are all argumentative, and principally founded upon that letter.

For the present I shall say nothing about that letter or the reasoning founded upon it. You express much forbearance towards me, because you say I have been unfortunate. What do you mean by unfortunate? If you mean that I have suffered much bodily affliction, you are right; but thank God, those afflictions are past, and I am now, and have been for more than three years, in the enjoyment of vigorous uninterrupted health. But if by unfortunate, you mean that I was not elected President in 1824-5, I must beg leave to dissent from the truth of that assertion. I am conscious of being less unfortunate than you were. You, after obtruding your name upon the nation as a candidate for the Presidency, in a manner until then unknown, and I trust will never be repeated, and conducted yourself in the same unprecedented manner while your name was permitted to be up, were put down by the State of Pennsylvania, upon which you affected to rely for success. My name was put up by my friends for the same office, and by them was kept up, notwithstanding my bodily afflictions, till the election was consummated in the House of Representatives in February, 1825. No man in the nation was better pleased at my exclusion than I was; for I then verily believed, and I do now believe, that had I been elected, my remains would now be reposing in the national burying ground, near the eastern branch of the Potomac. I was, therefore, far from considering myself unfortunate in the result of the election in the House of Representatives.

Your forbearance towards me has been affected because you believed you could more effectually injure me. I request, therefore, that hereafter, if you should have occasion to write or speak of me, you will not again feign a forbearance you do not feel. You affect to lament that my friends did not interfere and prevent my meddling with this matter. I make no doubt that you would have been very glad to have been spared the trouble of making so elaborate a comment upon a letter of three pages. I make no doubt that you dislike the idea of being exposed and stripped of the covert you have been enjoying under the President's wings, by means of falsehood and misrepresentation. You assert that my suspicion that you wrote or caused to be written, the letter which was published in a Nashville Gazette, is without foundation. A man who knows as I do, the small weight to which any assertion of yours is entitled, in a matter where your interest leads you to disregard the truth, must have other evidence than your assertion, to remove even a suspicion. You ask why I charge Mr. Adams with having written or caused that letter to be written? The answer is easy and conclusive. That letter contained two falsehoods—one intended to injure me; the other intended to benefit you, and that which was for your benefit taking from Mr. Adams half the credit of defending Gen. Jackson, and giving it to you. 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 half the merits 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 and not upon Mr. Adams, subsequent events strongly corroborate the inference deducible from the contents of the published letter. During the whole of the Presidential canvass of '23, '24, I have no recollection of any act of Mr. Adams, tending to vilify me; but you know, that you set up the Washington Republican in Washington for the express purpose of vilifying my reputation and had the effrontery and shamelessness to cause it to be published by a clerk in the department, whose tenure of office was your will. The facts which I have stated will exonerate Mr. Adams from the charge of having any concern with the Nashville letter, and fix that charge upon you in the estimation of reasonable men, your denial to the contrary notwithstanding.

You place great stress upon the conduct of gentlemen in Congress, whom you assert to be my friends. This is what might be expected from a man of your loose principles, or rather no principles. My friends in Congress were men who would have been insulted, had any man, however elevated, approached them in the language of entreaty and persuasion. I never did, and never would, if I were to live a thousand years, interfere with a man who was acting under the obligation of an oath, to persuade or entreat him to act contrary to the convictions of his own judgment; and if I were that member, and any man, however elevated he might be, were to interfere with me by way of entreaty or persuasion, I should feel myself insulted,

and should certainly insult the person so interfering. The only conversation I recollect ever to have participated in with a member of Congress, in reference to the foregoing subject, was with Mr. Cobb, at my own house, in the presence of Mr. Macon, of North Carolina. In that conversation, I supported Gen. Jackson's right to put Ambrister to death. Mr. Macon, I believe, was convinced; but I am not certain that Mr. Cobb was. That gentleman acted in concert with Mr. Clay, in the part he took in the discussion upon the Seminole war. Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Lacombe were men of high character and experience, and leant upon no person. Mr. Epes made a speech in favour of the report which was intended to be made and was in consequence placed on the committee in place of Mr. Forsyth. I wonder you had not discovered, that he too was a particular friend of mine.

You say that, as it appears from Mr. McDuffie's letter, I had no scruples about disclosing the secrets of the cabinet, I had it in my power to change the opinions of my friends, by disclosing the contents of the confidential letter. No person who had a proper regard for the feelings or character of Mr. Monroe, could make use of that letter; for it was manifestly written under the impression that Mr. Monroe was capable of that duplicity which would connive at the execution of a measure, and disavow it after it was executed. I must confess, had I been President, I should not have been flattered by its reception. If I had as you erroneously represent me, been little scrupulous about disclosing the secrets of the cabinet, which is positively denied, notwithstanding Mr. McDuffie's statement, I should have made no use of that letter, and this from respect to Mr. Monroe's feelings and character.

In the whole course of my life, I have been so much in the habit of uttering my opinions, and stating facts as they were known to me, when made proper by time and place, that, when I am charged, after any lapse of time, with having uttered opinions or made statements of facts, I do not hesitate to admit such opinions were uttered, or statements of them made if the opinions correspond with those I entertained, or with the knowledge of facts I then possessed; but when I am charged with uttering opinions I never entertained, or with making statements of facts, inconsistent with my knowledge of them at the time they are alleged to have been made, or under circumstances not rendering the disclosure proper, I have as little hesitation in declaring the charge false. Applying this rule to Mr. McDuffie's letter, I have no hesitation in saying he is mistaken in every part of it. I can account for his mistake, in the first of his statements. In my letter to Mr. Forsyth, I state, that, previous to Mr. Monroe's return to that city, you, in a private conversation with me, stated your determination to pursue the course in the cabinet that you did, and that I approved of it. Mr. McDuffie has applied this conversation to the cabinet deliberations, and has made me approve of your proposition unfriendly to Gen. Jackson, which I aver is untrue, and you yourself know it to be untrue. At the time of this private conversation I had never seen the orders under which Gen. Jackson acted, nor any of his despatches, nor heard of the confidential letter. I relied upon the accuracy of your representations, and, according to them Gen. Jackson appeared clearly in the wrong, and I did not hesitate to tell you I thought you in the right. At the time I visited Georgia, I have no recollection that Gen. Jackson had adopted any measure to forestal public opinion, and thereby to anticipate the decision of the administration; nor have I at this moment any recollection of the existence of any such measure. If none such existed, and I believe none existed, then it is utterly impossible that I should have expressed myself as Mr. McDuffie makes me. I have, therefore, no hesitation in saying, the whole of Mr. McDuffie's statement is a mistake. I say nothing of the motives of Mr. McDuffie in making the statement, because I do not know them; but this I will say, that Mr. McDuffie has, upon a former occasion, shown a willingness to injure and asperse me. It is somewhat doubtful for what purpose Mr. McDuffie's statement was obtained, as his statement has no direct bearing upon the facts stated in my letter to Mr. Forsyth. It appears to me, on reflection, that the principal object in obtaining it was to impeach my veracity. If that was the object, I have no fear of the result, where he and I are known. To give you a Rowland for your Oliver, read the enclosed extract of the letter of Capt. Ross. I know nothing of the correctness of his statement, further than that he made the statement to me in substance, before he left Washington, and further added, that he communicated his impression to a military officer residing in Washington, and attached to the War Department, who told him that it was no matter of surprise; that the officers attached to the Department had made that discovery before. I have left the name of the officer a blank, as I was unwilling to involve him in a controversy with you, without his consent.

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, all the questions which had been discussed were, I thought, decided, and Mr. Adams directed to draft a note to the Spanish Minister, conformable 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 the office, when, about one or two 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, and he was directed to draft another note pursuant to the decisions which had been made. The next morning I sat off for Georgia. Mr. Adams' letter, which is now before me, contains a repetition of the arguments he used in the cabinet; and in the letter 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 inferrible, that Mr. Adams did not agree to the decision of the cabinet, and that you must have known it: for it is clear that he did not agree to it on Saturday; and it is highly improbable that any arguments 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.

You dwell with much stress upon the lapse of time since those deliberations, and seem to be unconscious that the same lapse of time applies to all your certifi- cates, negative and affirmative. You seem to repose full confidence on Mr. McDuffie's recollection, although it was of casual conversation, not likely to make the same impression upon the mind as the facts contained in my letter to Mr. Forsyth. You even refer to your recollection of a very trivial fact which you say happened during the next session of Congress. I have now a letter before me, dated in October, 1831, in which I state to you, that you had a short time before informed me, that your memory could not be relied upon as to facts. You wrote me a letter the next day, in which you did not controvert that fact; yet now after a lapse of twelve years, you rely upon your memory for a very trivial fact, viz: Your application to see that private confidential letter, because you had received some hints about it, and you believe from some of my friends. Do you not perceive some inconsistency in your essay? You had just censured me for not using this letter, and then insinuate that I had used it, as you seem to think I ought to have used it. In truth, I do not believe one word of your insinuation, nor do I believe you do, for the reasons I have already stated: I know I never made use of it. But you insinuate that I made disclosures of the secrets of the cabinet to the editor of the newspaper in Milledgeville, because General Clarke suspected it, and because I never denied it. I never knew that I was charged with it, except in General Clarke's book, and there the evidence offered in support of it was so ridiculous, that no person, less ignorant and malignant than General Clarke, would have paid the least attention to it. Besides, if I had denied that charge, and not gone through his book, and denied every charge in it, however ridiculous, it would have been alleged by you and your co-laborers, that the charges not denied were admitted. But, sir, since you renew the charge, I give it the most unqualified denial. The editor of the paper alluded to said, in my presence, that he had been informed that it had been proposed in the cabinet to arrest General Jackson. I simply replied, that no such proposition had been made in the cabinet.

Let us apply your own rule to you, and see how you will stand the test of your reasoning. A Charleston paper of last March stated, that you had been charged with participation in the Ninian Edwards plot against my reputation. Have you ever denied this charge? Again; you have been charged in the South-Carolina papers with being a nullifier. Mr. Gales has denied this for you; but have you denied it yourself? Have you ever considered the ridiculous figure you may cut in the sequel, if this nullification advances much farther?

In 1816 you were among the foremost in avowing the expediency and right of protecting domestic manufactures. Now your disciples deny the right, and propose to nullify an act of Congress, founded upon the principle of protection. You may depend upon it, if you and your friends should proceed so far as to incur the guilt, and suffer the punishment of treason and unsuccessful rebellion, you will meet with no sympathy among the sister States. I have said that Mr. Wirt's negative statement is the only evidence you have in support of your negative assertion, that the confidential letter was not produced and read in the cabinet. For proof of this read the enclosed extract of Mr. Monroe's letter, by which it will be seen that, having no reliance upon his own recollection, he applied to Mr. Wirt for information; and he candidly and very properly adds: "Still as the question turns on memory alone, Mr. Wirt as well as I may be mistaken; and in regard to me, as I was sick in bed when I received the letter, that presumption is the more probable."

You appear to boast of the services you rendered Gen. Jackson in his utmost need. What those services were, you have not condescended to state in your very elaborate essay. Nor have I heard them hinted at before. Perhaps your notorious services were in entreating and persuading members of Congress to approve acts that you deemed worthy of punishment when deliberating in the cabinet. I will not however dwell upon this topic. If you can satisfy the President that you rendered him essential service, I have no objection that you should be rewarded for it. What I object to, is that you should be rewarded for ascribing to me your own acts.

You say that to place Gen. Jackson's defence upon the confidential letter, is to do him an injury, and that his reports never rested it upon that ground. Whether this be true or not, I have no means of judging. But, in the course of the subsequent winter, I saw an essay in a Nashville paper, in which the writer asserted, that the Administration knew before Gen. Jackson entered Florida, that he intended to take the Spanish forts; and that knowing it, and not countermanning it, the Administration had made his acts their own, and were not at liberty to disavow them. I carried this letter to the President, and requested him to read the essay, giving him my opinion that the essay was either written under Gen. Jackson's immediate inspection, or by a person that had access to his private papers; for that the confidential letter was evidently referred to. A short time after, he returned the Gazette, saying, he entirely concurred with me in opinion. Extract No. 2 of his letter shows, that Mr. Monroe now recollects the circumstances, to which my letter to him called his attention. I must take some further notice of Mr. Wirt's negative statement, before I close this commentary. Mr. Wirt commences his letter by expressing doubts about disclosing the secrets of the cabinet without the consent of the President, and every member of the cabinet present. I suppose this squeamishness of Mr. Wirt suggested to you the very wise declaration you have ventured upon the same subject. Mr. Wirt's squeamishness yields to the consideration that you only request information as to your own part, in the declarations of the cabinet. This he gravely assents to, and then states that you proposed an enquiry into General Jackson's conduct. He then proceeds with nearly two pages, stating what he does not recollect. All that he does not recollect, I do distinctly recollect, and so does Mr. Crowninshield. But what he does not recollect, is arrayed by you as evidence against what I and Mr. Crowninshield do recollect. And Mr. Wirt, from his manner of stating his non-recollections, seems disposed to countenance the use you have made of his negative statement. You are welcome to it, and to the reasoning with which he has supplied you. Since the dissolution of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, I have not felt myself restrained from disclosing any fact that transpired in it. While it existed, I disclosed none of its secrets, & whoever says I did, says what is not true. I know of no intrigues to injure you or any other person, either directly or indirectly. Had I been called on in the year 1825, after the 3d of March, as I was called on by Mr. Forsyth last Spring, I should have made the same disclosures then, that I made to Mr. Forsyth. Whether Mr. Wirt remembers the facts contained in my statement, is perfectly indifferent to me, even if Mr. Crowninshield had not remembered them. But his recollection of the facts is almost as distinct as mine. Mr. Adams' recollection is, that it was proposed to bring General Jackson to trial, and Mr. Crowninshield's that you were severe upon the conduct of the General.

I believe both of these gentlemen have given the impression that your arguments made upon their minds, indeed neither of them have intended to give your express words. I am, therefore, notwithstanding their statements, of opinion that the proposition ascribed to you in my letter to Mr. Forsyth is literally correct, although "it may be to rate his (your) understanding very low, and may be absurd on its face." I believe I have now gone through your tedious essay, and have been much more tedious than I expected to be; but your insinuations have been so multifarious and various that I could not well be shorter. A few words more about conspiracies. General Noble informed me, that for about two weeks before Ninian Edwards set off for the West, in 1823, he lodged in the same house with him, and that a person in going to Edwards' room, had to pass by his, and that during that time you paid a daily visit to his (Edwards') room, and spent from one to two hours with him. He sent his memorial back to Washington, while he was on his journey; it is therefore highly probable that the most of it was written in Washington, and reviewed and revised by you during your daily visits to that compeer of yours. Every person who knew Edwards was convinced he never would have ventured upon such a step without having received assurances from persons he deemed capable of protecting him. Your letter of the third of July to the managers of the fourth of July dinner in Washington, was considered at the time an act redeeming the pledge of protection you had given him. It is true Mr. Adams and Mr. McLean united with you in the letter. Mr. Adams' motive for signing it was apparent. Edwards was his political supporter. His son-in-law held the vote of Illinois in his hands, without which, it appeared in the event, Mr. Adams could not have been elected. Mr. Adams, therefore, had an adequate political motive for doing the act. You could have had no such motives, nor could Mr. McLean, I believe, have had any other motive for his conduct than that of subserviency to your wishes, and a desire to enable you to fulfil your promise to Edwards. From the time Gen. Noble gave me the information, and that you signed the letter of the 3d of July, I never doubted that the plot against my reputation was your handy-work, and originated in your brain so fertile in mischief. And yet you complain of intrigue and conspiracies. I have through my whole life been a plain thorough-going man. When difficulties have arisen, I have honestly met them, and under the protection of the shield of integrity have

vanquished them. I am now too old to adopt a new course of conduct. I am in retirement, and have no wish to emerge from that retirement. I had like to have forgot your charge of infringing the purity of the electoral colleges. I wrote the letter to Mr. Berry of which you complain, and that was not the only letter. But at the time that letter was written, I had no information that the electors of Kentucky were pledged to vote for you as Vice President, nor have I any other evidence more before me than your assertion, which every person as well acquainted with you as I am, will admit to be very slender evidence. I wrote no letter to any State where I knew the electors were pledged to vote for Vice President.

You seem to think that I am under the influence of resentment. You are mistaken. Resentment is only felt against equals or superiors, and never against inferiors. From the time you established the Washington Republica for the purpose of slandering and vilifying my reputation, I considered you a degraded, a disgraced man, for whom no man of honor and character could feel any other than the most sovereign contempt. Under this impression, I was anxious that you should be no longer Vice-President of the United States.

WM. H. CRAWFORD.

Extract of a letter from Benjamin W. Crowninshield to Wm. H. Crawford, dated 25th July, 1830.

"You ask me if I recollect while in the councils of the cabinet, of a letter written by General Jackson to the President Monroe? I do recollect of a conversation about a private letter, which Mr. Calhoun, I believe, asked for, and the President said he had not got it, but upon an examination found he had it. This letter contained information and opinions respecting Spain and her colonies, the Floridas; but the particulars I cannot now undertake to say or state correctly. I remember, I think, your stating that the circumstances then spoken of, did fully explain General Jackson's conduct during the campaign. I remember, too, that Mr. Calhoun was severe upon the conduct of the General, but the words particularly spoken have slipped my recollection."

Extracts of a letter from James Monroe to Wm. H. Crawford, dated 8th August, 1830.

1st Extract.—"I lay in bed more than a week, during which that letter was removed, and every thing relating to the war having been previously arranged, it was forgotten and never read by me until after the meeting of the administration, and the decision as to the course to be pursued in reference to its management. My impression is that I read it then on a suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, that it required my attention. Had I read it when I received it, I should have considered it as confidential, and never have shown it to any one, however great my confidence in them might be. As the question whether that letter was mentioned in the cabinet involved the correctness of my memory, I did not wish in replying to Mr. Calhoun's letter, to rest on my memory alone, and in confidence made an appeal through a friend to Mr. Wirt, who declared that it was not mentioned in the cabinet, nor brought before it, and that he had never heard of it before."

2d Extract.—"I well recollect the confidential communication referred to in yours, which afterwards passed between us, and the inference respecting the publication in Tennessee, in which we both concurred."

Extract of a letter from Jack R. Ross, a Captain in the late army, dated Tuscaloosa, 4th Sept. 1830.

"I reached Washington in April of May, 1823, as an applicant for the office of Marshal for the Alabama District. At the time of my arrival the President (Mr. Monroe) was at his plantation in the country. I did consult with you as my friend as to the most probable means of obtaining the office, and you did advise me to endeavor to interest Mr. Calhoun in my favor, alleging that you thought he exercised more influence with the President than any other member of the cabinet, and perhaps than all the rest together. I accordingly called on him and presented my letters to him, and received from him such assurance as confidently induced me to think he was warmly my friend. Some days after this interview with Mr. Calhoun, Robert Crawford arrived at Washington, as an applicant for the office for my friend Major Armstrong who had applied, ignorant of the fact that I had applied. Mr. Crawford did not bring with him letters from Gen. Jackson, recommending Maj. Armstrong, but Maj. Armstrong went on to Nashville, procured the letters, and forwarded them to Washington; and I recollect distinctly taking from the Post-Office one morning, a letter from Major A. to Robt. Crawford, the contents of which Mr. Crawford shewed me, in which the Major says, I have by this day's mail sent on letters from General Jackson to Mr. Monroe and Mr. Adams, or words to that effect. These letters, I am sure, came by the same mail that brought the one from Major A. to Mr. Crawford, and must have been received that very morning, and with this knowledge of the fact, I again called on Mr. Calhoun to consult with him, but said nothing of these letters. He told me I should have met with no difficulty in obtaining the appointment, but that Mr. Monroe had received General Jackson's letter, recommending