lake's representatives objecting to it, on the other; and its being doubtful, if the evidence were ever so plain, whether it can properly be bro't into Mr. Timberlake's or your public account, I must leave it to be adjusted between you and them.

The fourth item, in your account current, is as follows, viz:

"Amount of ration money, paid to officers' waiters for undrawn rations, see list (B) $1,-226 36."

This claim has not the slightest evidence to support it except Norman's affidavit, and is totally unintelligible to me.

The fifth item is as follows, viz:

"Amount paid H. K. Mower (Mid'n) by order of Com. Patterson, (see list C.) $98 84."

No order of Commodore Patterson is produced, nor is there any receipt to the paper adduced as a voucher. Indeed, it is only a list of bills incurred on account of Midshipman Mower, during his last illness, without any evidence whatever that they were paid by you. If they were so paid, it is presumed they are included in your bill for Hospital Expenses at Mahon, and have already been passed to your credit. Moreover, it could not have been paid to H. K. Mower; for the list is made out on the 14th of April, 1828, and he died on the 7th.

The sixth item is as follows, viz:

"Amount paid G. T. Larico (court paper No. 56) $169 57."

This paper is in the following words, viz:

"U. S. Navy Department—Purser's Department.

Robert B. Randolph, Esq. Lieut. Acting Purser—U. S. Ship Constitution,
Dr. to G. T. Larico.

To 4 boxes Havana Sugar, gross wt.		
	1715 English pounds.	
Tare 13 per cent.	223	
Net weight	1492 at 104 cents per pound,	$156 66
Commission 2 1-2 per cent.		3 91
		$169 57

"I declare to have received of Robert B. Randolph, Esq. one hundred and sixty dollars and fifty-seven cents in full of the above account.

PORT MAHON, 10th April, 1828. G. THEODORE LADICO.

This is notoriously a bill for Purser's private stores. The sugar you were permitted to sell, and, it is presumed, did sell to the ship's company at a profit of 50 per cent. You charged it to the officers and men as so much cash, and obtained a credit for it as cash at this office in the settlement of your account.

On what ground, therefore, this bill, more than any or all your bills for private stores, is now charged in your public account, is to me incomprehensible.

The seventh item is as follows, viz:

"Amount paid Thomas Norman (Purser's clerk) $600.

It is not pretended that the government owed any thing to Thomas Norman, nor is any voucher, nor even a receipt from him, produced by you to sustain this claim. In his testimony before the Court of Inquiry, Norman stated that Mr. Timberlake owed him this sum, and that you paid it to him in 1829. You both arrived in the U. S. in July, 1828, and your account was settled in October of that year. If any thing was due from Mr. Timberlake to Mr. Norman, it is remarkable that he should have applied to you for payment instead of Mr. Timberlake's representatives, and still more remarkable that you should have paid him without consulting them, and after a settlement of your account in this office, in which you professed to account for all the public moneys in your hands. In any view of the subject, this is a claim against Mr. Timberlake's representatives with which the government have no concern.

The eighth item is as follows, viz: $202 07." It is unnecessary to consider this claim until the money is shown to have been properly disbursed.

The tenth item is as follows, viz:

"1833, April 6.—My transportation per diem to this date now in arrears as per account annexed (D.) $1,422.

Whatever expenses you may have incurred during the investigation of this affair, have been the result of your own neglect in not charging yourself with the money and stores, received at Port Mahon, and taking proper vouchers for their disbursement.

It cannot be expected, therefore, that the Government will pay your expenses in addition to those already brought upon it by your irregularities in discharging your duties as Purser.

The eleventh item is as follows, viz:

"To this amount paid John Fernandez on account of John B. Timberlake, pay as seaman of the Frigate Constitution 15th April, 1828, per account and receipt of document marked (E) hereunto annexed $154 44."

Your pay roll shows that this sum has already been passed to your credit.—The precise sum, and the corresponding dates were pointed out to me in your presence, among your credits, before the Court of Inquiry.

The twelfth item is as follows, viz:

"To this amount paid Hospital Department at Port Mahon on account of Midshipmen Mower, as per Surgeon Cornick's certificate bearing date 23d April, 1828, as in document (F) thereto appended $10."

The document (F) is in favor of "Angelina Fabrique," for hire of room for Midshipman Mower $10;" but it is not receipted, and is therefore no voucher.—Besides, it is dated 23d April, 1828, and in your account settled in this office is a paper to the following effect, viz.

"Hospital Department, U. S. Ship Constitution,

"Daniel T. Patterson, Esq. Commander.

To R. B. Randolph, Dr.

"1828, April 26, To amount of sundry bills paid for the Hospital Department at Mahon,	$228 70

"Received for the above by charge in act. current.

"Approved, R. B. RANDOLPH, Acting Purse.

"Daniel T. Patterson."

If Angelina Fabriques' bill of the 23d was paid at all, it was undoubtedly included in this bill of the 26th, and has already been passed to your credit.

Your claim to this credit can be established only by a receipted voucher, and by the production of the "sundry bills" included in that which has already passed to your credit, showing that it is not one of them.

Having disposed of each item of your account, it is proper I should remind you that the question involved is not one altogther between you and the government. The rights of another party are involved. To you were intrusted the funds and the property for which Mr. Timberlake, at the time of his death, was entitled to a credit, as well as his books and papers on which depended the correct settlement of the disbursements made by him during a long cruise. A portion of those books and papers, you have never delivered, either to the 4th Auditor or Mr. Timberlake's representatives, some of them having been since produced by Mr. Norman, and others being still missing.

Those found by me in the office were in such a condition as to make a just settlement of Mr. Timberlake's account very difficult if not impracticable.

But among those books and papers produced by you in such disorder and confusion, were found the vouchers for those payments for which you now claim that the credits shall be taken from Mr. Timberlake and given to you. The agency you had in furnishing those papers and your omission to render any account of the money and property left at his death, for which he was entitled to a credit, give his representatives, in my opinion, a right to insist that the credits given to him upon vouchers in due form shall not be molested. I am satisfied that to deprive them of those credits, until you have fully shown and accounted for the whole amount of money and property received by you at Mr. Timberlake's death, would be another act of gross injustice in addition to those already suffered by them in the management of the effects left by him on board the Constitution.—But if I am wrong in this conclusion, my error will be less injurious to you because you may, if you think proper, have the points decided by the judicial tribunals of the country.

In conclusion, I have to express my regret, that after your reply of the 12th ult. to my letter of the 8th, in which you said, "I will most cheerfully account with the department on the terms indicated in your communication," you have not complied with those terms, particularly in not correcting the error in your slop account, and in making no attempt to separate the payments on your Pay Roll, under the head of "Advances," made out of your own money and stores, from those made out of the stores of Mr. Timberlake.

Very respectfully,
Your obt. servant,
AMOS KENDALL.

LT. R. B. RANDOLPH, U. S. Navy.

Accompanying this letter was the following from the 2d Comptroller: viz:

APRIL 18, 1833.

Amos Kendall, Esq. 4th Auditor.

SIR: I have examined the claims of Lt. R. B. Randolph, reported by you to this office on the 17th inst.; and agree with you in the conclusion, that his claims are unsupported by such testimony as will justify the Accounting Officers, under the circumstances of the case, to pass any portion of them to his credit.

The claims and papers reported, are herewith returned.

Very respectfully, &c.
J. B. THORNTON.

It may be safely alleged, that there is not one credit in this whole account, which, under the circumstances of the case, would have been admitted by any Court of law or equity in the United States. So far as they seem to involve the semblance of truth, they are sustained only by vague oral testimony in opposition to written vouchers and receipts; and no Court of Equity would take credits so sustained from Mr. Randolph, even with plenary evidence that he paid them, unless he first washed his hands of every stain by accounting fully for the money and effects of the deceased Purser which had come into his possession.

The Mr. Norman, spoken of in these papers, is a drunken, dissolute man, who has left his own wife and family—received an advance from the Government to enable him to attend the Court of Inquiry, though Randolph's witness—spent the money without going—enlisted in the army as a private soldier—was discovered there—and was brought to Washington under guard, at the expense of the Government, that Randolph might have no pretence for say his witness could not be had. He declared to one of the officers, that he was to keep the accounts and divide the profits of the pursership with Randolph—had in his possession a part of Timberlake's books and papers, and received $600 from Randolph in 1829, said to be on Timberlake's account, though never avowed his representatives that his claim existed, or that he had the money to pay it, or that he had paid it.

After reviewing the foregoing letters, Randolph made no further effort to settle his account. Having remained six months unattended to, and there being indication that he never intended to settle it, a statement was made out for suit on the 30th of October last. All after that was done under the direction of the Solicitor of the Treasury, who has only done his duty in the manner "required by the letter of the law."

From Bell's London Weekly Messenger of 20th October.

RUSSIA, HER PROJECTS AND STRENGTH.—Nobody can doubt the ambitious strides which Russia is making towards the east of Europe, and her intention of appropriating to herself, at the first opportunity, the tottering columns and splendid fragments of the Ottoman empire; but surely there is not much danger to be feared from this power in the west of Europe; her power and means, as respects France and England, are egregiously overrated by the Tory papers, who threaten England and France with her vengeance should they persist to interfere in the affairs of Holland and Spain. It may be worth while to take a cursory glance at the Czar and his dominions in order to exhibit how little England and France have to apprehend on this account.

The Russian army may be estimated on paper at 800,000 men, but it cannot maintain beyond its frontier more than 120,000 for any length of time on the war establishment. We do not think, from all we have heard and seen, that Russia can, before a remote period, become really formidable to the west of Europe, except as an auxiliary to either Prussia or Austria; in which case the force she could send to coalesce with these powers, composed as it would be of men possessing some of the best military qualities, such as bravery, devotion, patience, docility, and a total submission of the will and body to the command of their superiors, might indeed cause the scale to preponderate.

But all the operations of Russia, as respects the west of Europe, are liable to a course of counter-check. Prussia, although allied to the Muscovite empire by marriage, and willing to avail herself of the protection of the Czars against France, cannot, in reality, be the friend of Russian aggrandizement, pushed to the extent of its ambitious views. Austria, governed at present by the same motives, has more reason to dread Russia than even Prussia; she has no frontier to protect her against the 40,000 Cossacks who could be let loose upon the plains of Hungary, and might gallop up even to the walls of Vienna, unless protected by Hungarian bosoms aided by the soldiers of Frederick William. Austria and Prussia must then, by every rule of policy, make a league, defensive and offensive. These two powerful kingdoms must become the barriers against French restlessness on one side, and Russian ambition on the other. Prussia counts 300,000 bayonets, and Austria 350,000. The Germanic body can send half as many more. These are all good troops and are concentrated, while Russia has to drag her masses from the frontiers of Asia; from the Polar regions, and from the banks of the Araxes to the borders of Silesia. Half of these men would never reach their destination. We have seen the prodigious sacrifice made by Russia to put down a revolt in Poland; an army of 150,000 veteran warriors, matched against 30,000 Polish troops, and 70,000 of indiscriminate levies. We have seen that terrible struggle prolonged from the month of February, 1832, to the month of September in the same year; and Warsaw then captured only upon terms. If Poland, single handed, could contend for such a length of time with doubtful success against Russia, what has western Europe to fear from her? She has indeed conquered Poland; but what has she gained? A tomb! and the temporary subjugation of a people who always were her bitter enemy, and who now hate her with accumulated fury. The loss sustained by the armies of the Czar, in this disastrous conflict, has been estimated at 60 or 70,000 men. Was Poland worth subjugating at such a price? Can Russia, with her scanty population easily recover from such losses? Did Russia display much military talent and power in her campaigns against Turkey and Persia? Were not the resources of the Sultan and the Shah over estimated, and the difficulties of their country exaggerated by the admirers of the Mussulmans and the depreciators of the Muscovites? and thus, when their conquest was effected, were not the triumphs of the Russian arms too much exalted by the very parties who had before held them too cheap? The Sultan and the Shah may indeed lick the dust from the footstool of the Czar, for he is their master, but nevertheless, if Europe be true to herself, she need not fear the Giant of the North,—this bugbear which Napoleon set up to account for his own failure in his rash campaign against Moscow, and which very campaign would most probably have produced the result he proposed to himself, that of crushing the semi-barbarous power, had he acted with common discretion.

It once answered the purpose of the British government to set up Alexander as the Chief of the destinies of Europe; to sing the heroic deeds of the Muscovites, and exalt their power to the utmost as a check upon France; but now our policy is altered:—let us look nearer at the Colossus, and we shall find that his head is of brass, but his feet are of clay.

As a maritime power Russia is utterly contemptible; for the Turks, before the battle of Navarino, shut her up perpetually in the Black Sea, and the ice in the Baltic is her natural blockade for six months in the year.

Nevertheless, we did not require the recent pamphlet to show that Russia is advancing in intelligence, in wealth, and in power; but this empire, whilst it approximates towards civilization, must some day split into many parts, and with its integrity will vanish the dread of its power. But we are mistaken if we think Russia has the resources for any prolonged contest either in the east or the west.

The present commercial system of Russia is bad in the extreme. She raises her revenue, with all but one exception, from the most objectionable funds—from a capitation tax, from heavy duties, on exports and imports, and from brandy. Now, the treasures of Russia, which are mineral and agricultural, are nothing worth, without a reciprocal system of trade with other nations, and more particularly with England, whose capital Russia wants to enable her to work even her own mines to advantage, and to send forth their treasures to the world by means of navigable canals and passable roads. The Russian sovereigns and ministers are mere soldiers, and know nothing of finance or of commerce. They occupy themselves with making soldiers instead of merchants, and without the latter no country can become either powerful or civilized. Nevertheless, now and then a faint gleam of light flashes across the view of the Czar; he would perhaps, fain follow it up, but he has no minister to second him, no enlightened counsellor to advise him. Look at his late contract as respects tallow and hemp, and his arbitrary exactions on British shipping, of which we gave an account this week in a letter from Hull. His minister of finance is a mere [illegible] What can be expected from such a system?—After all, what has the military system done for Russia? What have her armies, powerful as they are, effected? They were mismanaged and beaten in the first campaign in Bulgaria, and their victorious eagles of the second campaign grew pale and turned back at Adrianople, upon the sight of a despatch from Sir Pulteney Malcolm, when they had their prize in view, and almost within their grasp.

They took Varna in three months, which they should have taken in three weeks; they failed once before Silistria, and never ventured to attack either Giurgivo or Shumla. But they lost 100,000 men; and gained some diamonds, a few shawls, some little renown, and many hard blows.

The Persian and Turkish campaigns cost the empire 300,000,000 roubles and 200,000 soldiers; and this in a country with small revenue, and smaller population, as compared with its extent. Again, but we will not repeat particulars, they were nine months in subduing the revolt in Poland, though the whole strength of Russia was placed at the gates of Warsaw.—Are we not right, therefore, in saying that the resources of this power are egregiously magnified by the Tory newspapers, and that the west of Europe has little to apprehend from her,—even if England and France were out of the question?

The following is the speech of Mr. Speaker STEVENSON, on taking the chair of the House of Representatives, on Monday last:

Gentlemen: This is the fourth time that you have been pleased to call me to this high office. For this new and distinguished mark of your confidence and favor, I pray you to accept my warm and grateful acknowledgments; and whilst it will be deeply valued and cherished by me as the best reward for any past service that I may have rendered, it shall inspire me with a zeal so to conduct myself, as to justify in some measure the choice of my friends, and merit the continued approbation of my country. Would to God, that I was better qualified, to fulfil the arduous duties of this chair, in a manner suitable to its dignity and importance, my own wishes and honor, and the just expections of the House. There are few stations, gentlemen, under our government, either in relation to their elevation, or the nature and extent of their duties, more laborious or responsible, than that of Speaker of this House; and there probably has been no period in the past history of our country, when the duties of the Chair were more important, or calculated to impose higher responsibilities, than at the present moment; enlarged as they necessarily must be, by the enlarged number of the House; by the increased mass of it ordinary business, and by those interesting and important subjects, which will, no doubt, be presented for consideration, and probably give rise to a deep political excitement.

For the last six years, my experience in this Chair has taught me, not only to know and feel its responsibilities and trials, but to know likewise how difficult and indeed impossible it is, in an office like this, whose duties must often be discharged amidst the warmth of party feeling, for any man whoever he may be, to free himself from censure or give unqualified satisfaction; and especially in times like these, when the acts of public men, are not passed lightly over, nor any very charitable judgment pronounced upon their motives.

Under these circumstances, gentlemen, sincerely distrustful of my abilities, both in their character and extent, I come again at your bidding, to this high office. All that I dare hope or promise, will be, to proceed in the path marked out, and in the spirit of the principles which I laid down for my government when I first came to this Chair. It shall be my constant and ardent desire, to discharge my duty with all the ability and address in my power; with the temper and moderation due to the station and the House, and at least with a zeal and fidelity of intention, which shall bear me up under every embarrassment and difficulty, and entitle me to the approbation, of the just and liberal portion of my country. But all my efforts must prove unavailing, without that liberal and cordial cooperation which the House have heretofore so kindly extended to the Chair. How much will depend upon yourselves, gentlemen, individually, and collectively, in preserving the permanent laws and rules of the House, and giving dignity and character to its proceedings, it is not necessary that I should attempt to impress on you, nor is it needful, I am sure, that I should admonish you of the magnitude of your trust, or the manner in which it ought to be discharged!—But this I will take occasion to say, that if it be true that this House is justly to be regarded as the great bulwark of liberty and order; if here, here in this exalted refuge, the people are to look for the security and safety of their free institutions, and to repose with unlimited confidence and affection, how important, how deeply important is it, that we prove ourselves worthy of the trust, and act as becomes the Representatives of a free and enlightened nation.

Yes, gentlemen, animated by a virtuous and patriotic zeal, let all our proceedings, I pray you, be marked with forbearance, moderation, and dignity; let us diligently and steadfastly pursue those measures, and those only, which are best calculated to advance the happiness and glory of our beloved country, and render that Union, which our fathers established for the protection of our liberties, imperishable, and immortal!

From the Commercial Intelligencer.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE U. STATES.

Fellow Citizens,—I announced on the 20th ultimo, that at an early day I would appear before you, at least to repel imputations cast upon my character, contained in the Globe, the official paper of the Executive, of the preceding day.

If the calumnious attack referred to had not been obviously sanctioned by the President of the United States, such is the character of the newspaper under his protection, that I should not have felt myself called upon to notice it.

In addressing you, I have hesitated between the adoption of a general exposition, and of a brief defensive address, accompanied by that part of the correspondence between the President and myself, which the official paper seems to have challenged me to produce. I adopt the latter course. In the correspondence you will find ample materials for an accurate comprehension of my case—one of insult and oppression.

On the 4th of December, 1832, without any solicitation on my part, I was unexpectedly invited to accept the office of Secretary of the Treasury. I sought to shun the station, did not consent to serve until asked for my decision, on the 30th January, and then consented reluctantly.

No doubt, subsequently to, as before the adjournment of Congress, speculators, for their own selfish ends, agitated the deposit question and kept up an excitement, felt by the President; but it was never intimated to me that he desired to concentrate in himself the power to judge and execute—to absorb the discretion given to the Secretary of the Treasury—and even to nullify the law itself. I never heard until after my entry into office, that he meant to remove the deposits, without further inquiry by Congress, or that he asked the opinions of the members of the Cabinet on the subject; on the contrary when after having entered the treasury department, unpledged, untrammelled, and unsuspicious, I was informed of what was meditated, I felt surprised at the intelligence, and mortification at the manner in which it was communicated to me.

On the 3d of June the President himself made known to me what was in contemplation and that he had the opinions of the members of the cabinet on the point; two of whom concurred with him, two of whom did not concur, and the fifth had not yet given a written opinion. He said that he would submit to me the written opinions of the four members of the cabinet, with his own views; and that he would expect me to give him my opinions frankly and fully. As if to urge me to avoid all reserve, he assured me, in a letter, dated Boston, June 26, transmitting the opinions and views "that it was not his intention to interfere with the independent exercise of the discretion committed to me by law over this subject."

But, when, on the 10th July, I gave my opinion frankly and fully, as an honest minister and man should do, there was every return but that of approbation. On the contrary, on the 22d of July, I was asked, whether it was my intention to refuse to remove the deposites if, after inquiry by an agent and advisement with the cabinet, the President should decide to remove them, as in such case, it "would become his duty, in frankness and candor, to suggest the course, which would be necessary on his part."

Not on my own account, but as an act of duty to the country, I now subjected my pride and feelings to restraint, by tendering, or in order to avert a present hostile breach, a future surrender of my post; in case I should not ultimately concur with the President. But, before my concurrence or non currence was made known, and whilst I still held in my hands the manuscript exposition, which was read in the cabinet on the 18th September, and then delivered to me by the President for my consideration, he virtually dismissed me as an officer, and insulted me as a man, by causing the official annunciation, hereto appended No. 1., to be published in the Globe of the 20th September.

Yet, after this, when it must have been obvious that, independently of other considerations of great weight, I was absolved from all respect for any past assurance, as letter No 2, which I personally presented to the President on the 21st September, according to my promise of September 19, was contumeliously sent back to me, in letter No. 3, intimating the existence of improper imputations in mine, No. 2, calling my attention to my assurance of July 22, and enquiring whether I concurred in removing the deposites. From this letter, No. 3, it must be evident that when it was written, my dismissal was not then deemed justifiable, on grounds subsequently suggested; for when the President wrote it, he knew that I refused to resign; he knew the contents of the letter deemed offensive, and yet he held the correspondence open.

What then, I ask, subsequently occurred?—Instead of treating this new indignity, the return of my letter, with silence, or evincing any other mode of satisfaction, I felt that I was on duty at a public post, and that I ought not to suffer it to be taken by surprise, I could not now mistake, in concluding that it was intended to insult me out of office, or to draw from me some expression, which might form a pretext for my removal on a minor point, so doubtful was the President, after all, of the propriety of removing an officer for not yielding, when desired, the discretion given to him by law.

Accordingly, I sent letter No 4, subsequently withdrawn for alteration, and then letters Nos. 5 and 6—No 5 especially because the President did not seem to comprehend me, when in my letter No. 2, I said, that after what had occurred subsequently to July 22, I felt absolved from all obligation to observe the assurances given at that time.

These last appeals, indicative of any thing but bad feelings or disrespect, were also sent back to me; in a letter No. 7, declaring my services no longer necessary. I submit to all just men to determine, by whom an assurance was given, and without cause disregarded.

Thus was I thrust from office—not because I had neglected any duty—not because I had differed with the President on any other point of public policy—not because I had differed with him about the Bank of the United States—but, because I refused, without further enquiry or action by Congress, to remove the deposites.

If in my letter No. 2, there is any thing, that should not have been there, I ask it to be borne in mind, that it was written under a deep sense of injury and insult.

I appeal to all prior letters and intercouse, to shew that I have not on any occasion forgotten my respect for the Chief Magistrate, or for myself; and I deny that, in my letter, there was inaccuracy of fact, with my knowledge.

As I considered my removal inevitable; I asked in my personal interview, and by letter No. 6; such order, as, when shown to the representatives of the people, would be an apology for leaving the station under my care. Had such order been given, all subsequent unpleasantness would have been prevented; for the present result I am not accountable.

If any doubt existed as to the propriety of submitting the annexed letters to the public eye, it is removed by the example set by the President in the attack which he has sanctioned, and against which this is my defence.

I appeal to the justice and generosity of all publishers of newspapers, who have inserted therein the attack upon me, whether I have not a claim upon them to allow me to be heard, by publishing the present letter, and the annexed documents.

Very respectfully yours,
W. J. DUANE.

Philadelphia, December 2, 1833.

APPENDIX.—No. 1.

From the Globe of Sept. 20, 1833.

"We are authorised to state that the deposites of the public money will be changed, from the Bank of the United State to the State Banks, as soon as necessary arrangements can be made for that purpose; and that it is believed they can be completed in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, in time to make the change by the first of October, and perhaps sooner, if circumstances should render an earlier action necessary on the part of the Government.

"It is contemplated we understand, not to remove at once, the whole of the public money now on deposite in the Bank of the United States, but to suffer it to remain there until it shall be gradually withdrawn by the usual operations of the Government. And this plan is adopted in order to prevent any necessity, on the part of the Bank of the United States, for pressing upon the commercial community, and to enable it to afford, if it think proper, the usual facilities to the merchants. It is believed that by this means the change need not produce any inconvenience to the commercial community, and that circumstances will not require a sudden and heavy call on the Bank of the United States so as to occasion embarrassment to the institution or the public."

No. 2.

The Secretary of the Treasury to the President of the United States.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Sept. 21st, 1833.

SIR:—I have the honour to lay before you—

1. A copy of my commission, empowering and enjoining me to execute my duty according to law, and authorising me to hold my office at your pleasure.
2. A copy of my oath of office, wherein I solemnly pledged myself to execute the trust committed to me with fidelity.
3. A copy of the 16th section of the law chartering the Bank of the United States, whereby the discretion to discontinue the deposite of the public money in that Bank, was committed to the Secretary of the Treasury alone.
4. An extract from your letter to me of the 26th of June, wherein you promise not to interfere with the independent exercise of the discretion, committed to me by (the above mentioned) law over this subject.
5. An extract from your exposition of the 18th inst. wherein you state that you do not expect me, at your request, order, or dictation, to do any act which I may believe to be illegal, or which my conscience may condemn.

When you delivered to me, on the 18th inst., the exposition to your views, above referred to, I asked you, whether I was to regard it as direction, by you to me, to remove the deposites; you replied that it was your direction to me to remove the deposites, but upon your responsibility; and you had the goodness to add, that if I would stand by you, it would be the happiest day of your life.

Solemnly impressed with a profound sense of my obligations to my country and myself; after painful reflection, and upon my own impressions, unaided by any advice such as I expected, I respectfully announce to you, sir, that I refuse to carry your directions into effect.

1. Not because I desire to frustrate your views, for it would be my pleasure to promote them, if I could do so, consistently with superior obligations.
2. Not because I desire to favor the Bank of the United States, to which I have ever been, and ever shall be, opposed.
3. Not to gratify any views, passions, or feelings of my own—but
4. Because I consider the proposed change of the depository, in the absence of all necessity, a breach of the public faith.
5. Because the measure, if not in reality, appears to be vindictive and abitrary, not conservative or just.
6. Because if the Bank has abused or perverted its powers, the judiciary are able and willing to punish; and in the last resort, the representatives of the people may do so.
7. Because the last House of Representatives of the United States, pronounced the public money in the Bank of the United States safe.
8. Because, if under new circumstances a change of depository ought to be made, the representatives of the people, chosen since your appeal to them in your veto message, will in a few weeks assemble, and be willing and able to do their duty.
9. Because a change to local and irresponsible banks will tend to shake public confidence, and promote doubt and mischief in the operations of society.
10. Because it is not sound policy in the Union to foster local banks, which, in their multiplication and cupidity, derange, depreciate, and banish the only currency known to the constitution, that of gold and silver.
11. Because it is not prudent to confide, in the crude way proposed by your agent, in local banks, dependent in a great degree upon each other; one dollar in silver cannot be paid for six dollars of the paper in circulation.
12. Because it is dangerous to place, in the hands of a secretary of the treasury, dependent for office on executive will, a power to favor or punish local banks, and consequently make them political machinery.
13. Because the whole proceeding must tend to diminish the confidence of the world in our regard for national credit and reputation, inasmuch as, whatever may be the abuses of the directors of the Bank U. S. the evil now to be endured must be borne by innocent persons, many of whom, abroad, had a right to confide in the law that authorized them to be holders of stock.
14. Because I believe that the efforts made in various quarters to hasten the removal of the deposites, did not originate with patriots or statesmen, but in schemes to promote selfish and factious purposes.
15. Because it has been attempted by persons and presses known to be in the confidence and pay of the administration, to intimidate and constrain the secretary of the treasury, to execute an act in direct opposition to his own solemn convictions.

And, now, sir, having with a frankness, that means no disrespect, and with feelings such as I lately declared them to be, stated to you, why I refuse to execute what you direct, I proceed to perform a necessarily connected act of duty, by announcing to you, that I do not intend voluntarily to leave the post, which the law has placed under my charge, and by giving you my reason for so refusing.

It is true, that, on the 22d July, you signified in language sufficiently intelligible, that you would then remove me from office, unless I would consent to remove the deposites, on your final decision; it may also be true that I should then have put it to test; and it is also true, that under a well grounded assurance, that your bank plan, the only one then embodied in the instructions drawn up by me for your agent, would be, as it proved, abortive, that for this and other causes, you would be content, I did state my willingness to retire, if I could not concur with you

But I am not afraid to meet the verdict of generous men, upon my refusal, on reflection, and after what has since occurred, to do voluntarily what I then believed I never could be asked to do. If I had a frail reputation, or had any sinister purpose to answer, I might be open to censure, for a neglect of punctilious delicacy; but I can have no impure motives, much less can I attain any selfish end; I barely choose between one mode of retirement and another; and I choose that mode, which I should least of all have preferred, if I had not exalted and redeeming considerations in its favor.

I have, besides, your own example; I do not say, that after you had promised "not to interfere with the independent exercise of the direction vested in me by law," you were wrong in interfering, if you really thought the public welfare a superior consideration to a mere observance of assurance made to me; nor can you say that I err, when upon a solemn sense of duty, I prefer one mode of removal from this station to another.

The course is due to my own self preservation, as well as to the public, for you have in all your papers held out an assurance, that you would not "interfere with the independent exercise of the discretion committed to me by law," over the deposites, and yet, every thing but actual removal of me from office, has been done to effect that end. So that, were I to go out of office voluntarily, you might be able to point to official papers, that would contradict me, if I said you interfered, and I should thus be held up as a weak or faithless agent, who regarded delicacy not shewn to himself, more than duty to his trust.

Sir, after all, I confess to you, that I have had scruples, for it is the first time that I have ever condescended to weigh a question of the kind: but I am content that it shall be said of me, that in July last I forgot myself, and my duty too, rather than it should be said that now, knowing the course that you pursue, I had in any way favored it; on the contrary, if I have erred, I am willing to be reproved, but my motives no man can impugn.

My refusal to resign cannot keep me, one moment longer than you please, in an office that I never sought, and at a removal from which I shall not grieve on my own account; it must, on the contrary, hasten it So that if you shall proceed in wresting from the Secretary of the Treasury the citadel in his possession, the act can only be accomplished by a mandate no longer standing in the breach.

And now, sir, allow me to repeat to you in sincerity of heart, that in taking the present course, under a solemn sense of my obligations, I feel a sorrow on your account, far greater than on my own. I have been your early, uniform and steadfast friend; I can have no unkind disposition, but shall cherish those of a kind nature, that I feel. You proudly occupy the hearts of your countrymen: but still it is the lot of humanity, at times, to err. I do ample justice to your motives, but I am constrained to regret your present proceedings, and I devoutly wish that you may live to see all my forebodings contradicted, and your measures followed by results beneficial to your country, and honorable to yourself.

With the utmost consideration,
Your obedient servant,
W. J. DUANE.

No. 3.

The President of the United States to the Secretary of the Treasury.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 21, 1833.

Sir—After you retired, I opened and read the paper you handed to me: I herewith return it as a communication which I cannot receive. Having invited the free and full communication of all your views, before I made up a final opinion upon the subject, I cannot consent to enter into further discussion of the question.

There are numerous imputations in the letter, which cannot, with propriety, be allowed to enter into a correspondence between the President and the head of a department. In your letter of July last, you remark—"But if, after receiving the information and hearing the discussion, I shall not consider it my duty, as a responsible agent of the law, to carry into effect the decision that you may then make, I will, from respect to you, and for myself, afford you an early opportunity to select a successor, whose views may accord with your own on the important matter in contemplation."—My communication to my cabinet was made under this assurance received from you; and I have not requested you to perform any thing which your sense of duty did not sanction. I have merely wished to be informed, whether

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0744.jpg