General Republican Star and Advertiser.

VOL. XXXII. EASTON, (MD.) TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 29, 1831. NO. 31...1550.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY MORNING
BY
Thomas Perrin Smith.

TERMS

Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance.—No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

ADVERTISEMENTS are inserted three weeks for *One Dollar*, and continued weekly for *Twenty five Cents* per square.

We copy from the Washington Telegraph of Tuesday, the following further documents connected with the correspondence between General Jackson and Mr. Calhoun. The subjoined letter from Mr. Crawford is the one alluded to by Mr. Calhoun in the letter from him to Mr. C. published in the pamphlet containing Mr. Calhoun's correspondence with the President.

To the Editor of the U. S. Telegraph.

Sir—I enclose to you for publication my letter to Major Hamilton, referred to in Mr. Crawford's letter to me of the 30th April, 1830, which last forms so prominent a place in the recent address of the Vice President to the people of the United States. Had I believed this letter of any importance to Mr. Calhoun, it would have been voluntarily communicated to him, after the receipt of his answer of the 1st of June to my letter to him of the 31st of May. I give it to the public, not because my opinion of it is changed, but because Mr. Calhoun, in his letter to the President of the 25th of August, 1830, after my offer to furnish him with a copy of it, if he desired it, reiterates the opinion that it ought to have been shown to him. This communication to Major Hamilton was made without enquiry into his motives for asking it. Certainly no hostility to Mr. Calhoun was imagined, nor is it perceived how the facts stated could, of themselves, be in any way injurious to him. Major Hamilton's character was to me a sufficient guarantee that the information requested was not sought for any unworthy purpose.

A word or two of explanation, in the further agency I have had in this affair, is justly due to Mr. Crawford. I heard nothing of my correspondence with Major Hamilton, and the subject was scarcely thought of, until during last winter that gentleman came to the Senate Chamber, and requested me to give to the President, if not improper in my judgment, the information I had given to him. I asked if he had not my letter. He answered that he had. I then said, Mr. Crawford spoke to me, and speaks to every body, of this affair, with the same indifference that he does of any other incident in his political life. I am sure he does not care what you do with the letter. You may give the President a copy of it.

Major Hamilton declined doing this, from a motive of delicacy. He stated that he had conversed or corresponded, I do not recollect which, with Mr. Calhoun on this subject, and that the statements of Mr. Crawford and Mr. Calhoun did not agree. He was therefore unwilling to interfere, further than to comply with the President's wish in asking of me the information.

On this statement, I was determined not to give the information without Mr. Crawford's express assent. The information was no longer a matter of indifference, and I did not choose to give it to the President without apprising Mr. Crawford that he and Mr. Calhoun differed in their account of the transaction, and without submitting to him my statement of our conversation for correction, if it was, in any respect, erroneous. I obtained for that purpose, and enclosed to him a copy of my letter to Major Hamilton.—His answer is before the public. I found, to my surprise, that I had erred in repeating what he had said, and to avoid the possibility of any other mistake, I deemed it safest to send to the President a copy of my letter to Major H. and Mr. Crawford's letter to me. In making this communication from respect to the personal delicacy of Major Hamilton, his name was kept out of view.

Justice to Mr. Crawford demands the publication of his letter to Mr. Calhoun. Having received from him a copy of it, shortly after it was written, I have submitted it to the inspection of some of those in whose judgment I know he reposes implicit confidence, and as they coincide with me in the opinion I have expressed, I send it to you for immediate insertion in your paper. It is for Mr. Crawford, and for him only, to decide whether any thing more is necessary for his justification. I have found myself very unexpectedly compelled to say any thing about this transaction, and trust that none of those who are interested in it, will find it necessary to introduce my name into the farther discussion of it.

JOHN FORSYTH.

Georgetown, Feb. 19, 1831.

Mr. Crawford to Mr. Calhoun.

WOODLAWN, 2d Oct. 1830.

Sir—Since the adjournment of Congress, the copy of a letter from you to the President, containing eleven sheets, has been placed in my hands. The object of this labored essay is to prove that a statement contained in a letter from me to the Hon. John Forsyth, of the Senate of the United States, is incorrect. If there was no evidence but that which is contained in that essay, I should not be afraid of convincing every rational and unprejudiced mind, that my statement is substantially correct.

In the brief comment which I intend to make upon your essay of eleven sheets, I propose to avoid the example you have set me in three things, viz: I shall not begin by deprecating the official dignity and weight of character of the person I address; when I meet with a fact that I cannot frankly and distinctly deny, I will not attempt to prove a negative by argument; and I shall not falsely and hypocritically profess a forbearance which I do not feel.

I shall first notice your observations upon the disclosure of the secrets of the cabinet, which you say is the first that has occurred, at least in this country.—Do you really believe this assertion, Mr. Calhoun? How did the written opinions 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 Edmond 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 no longer exists, 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 the II. and the French Minister, by which it was proved that Charles was a pensioner of Louis the XIV. King of France, and had secretly engaged to re-establish Popery in England. Yet in the face of all those facts, you dare 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 attempted 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 ascribed to you in my letter to Mr. Forsyth, is strong presumptive evidence that you believed his answer would confirm my statement. You remembered 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 cause that made you avoid interrogating them upon the principal fact. When you make the inquiry of Mr. Wirt you enclose him such an extract from my letter as informs him of the nature of the evidence you are in search of, because, I presume, you believed that extract would 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. Benj. 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 Gen. 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 examination found he had it. This letter contained information and opinions respecting Spain and her colony, 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 convicted of having attempted to pass off a falsehood on the President of the U. 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 rate 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 reprehended 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 arrest and trial? Was not the disapprobation in the case of the Seminole war a punishment? I think Gen. Jackson must have felt it to be such. I should have opposed 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 General 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, 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 letters I have written to them since the aforesaid period. There has been so little sympathy either individual or political between those 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 villifying my character and lauding yours, without stipulating that it should not be wielded against Gen. 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 ufortunate? 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 which I trust will never be repeated, and conducting 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, 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 elabarate a comment upon a letter of three pages. I make no doubt that you dislike the idea of being exposed and stripped of the cover 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 well 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 not 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 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 corroborative 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 villify me; but *you know*, that you set up the Washington Republican in Washington, for the express purpose of villifying 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 obligations of an oath, to persuade or entreat him to act contrary to the convictions of his own judgement; and if I were such 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 N. C. In the conversation, I supported Gen. Jackson's right to put Ambrister to death. Mr. Macon, I believe, was convinced; but I am not certain Mr. Cobb was. That gentleman acted in concert with Mr. Clay, in the part he acted in the discussion upon the Seminole war. Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Lacock were men of high character and experience, and leant upon no person. Mr. Eppes made a speech in favor 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 facts made, if the opinions corresponded 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 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 part of his statement. In my letter to Mr. Forsyth, I state, that previous to Mr. Monroe's return to the 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 General 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 General 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 General Jackson had adopted any measures 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 upon a former occasion showed 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 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 Captain Ross. I know nothing of the correctness of his statement, farther 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 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, 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 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 set off for Georgia. Mr. Adams's 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 fairly inferrable, 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 certificates, negative and affirmative.

You seem to repose full confidence on Mr. McDuffie's recollection, although it was of a 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, 1821, 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 hint 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 a 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 Gen. 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 own 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 further?

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 principles 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 General 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 meritorious 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, however, not 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 General Jackson's defence upon the confidential letter, is to do him an injury, and that he in 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 General Jackson entered into Florida, that he intended to take the Spanish forts; and that knowing it, and not countermanding 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 farther 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 declarations you have ventured upon the same subject. Mr. Wirt's squeamishness yields to the consideration that you only request information as to your part, in the declarations of the cabinet. This he gravely assents to, and then states that you proposed an inquiry 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 your 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, and 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 has 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 Gen. 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

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc3923_scm2847-0279.jpg