

"positions to me". But in reference to his answer to Mr. Buchanan's communication, in his letter to Carter Beverly, he says, "I requested Mr. Buchanan to say to Mr. Clay & his friends, that before I would reach the Presidential Chair by such means of bargain & corruption, &c". How I pray you, could he have had the rejection of a bargain, unless it had been proposed to him? The idea of a bargain necessarily suggests that of a proposition. In his address to the Publick disclosing Mr. Buchanan as his author, he says, "To be thus approached by a gentleman of Mr. Buchanan's character, & standing, assuring me that on certain terms & conditions being presented to him. Do not the words "terms & conditions" imply as strongly as human language can do, that a proposition had been made? He continues, "the character of Mr. Buchanan forbids the idea that he was acting on his own responsibility, or that under any circumstances, he would have been induced to propose an arrangement". The words "propose an arrangement" mean that a proposition had been made. Indeed, he uses the word "propose", conveying the very idea which he denied having expressed. Again, he says, "It may be proper to observe, that in the supposition, that Mr. Clay was privy to the proposition stated, I may have done injustice to him." † "The evening before he had communicated, substantially, the same proposition to Major Eaton." ‡ With what truth, then, does he deny that he said that Mr. Clay's "friends in Congress made propositions to him"? What, My Fellow Citizens, do you think of this? Is not such varication the strongest assurance of his guilt? Ought it not, I ask you, in the name of truth & justice,

† See letter to  
C. Beverly

‡ See address  
to the Publick

name of truth & justice,