

## JUDGE CLAYTON.

We supposed that this man had already acquired enough of notoriety, without making it necessary to stamp upon his forehead the brand of *wilful and deliberate falsehood*, and to exhibit him to the public as unworthy the confidence of honorable men. But he has sought his fate, and must now abide the judgment of the public—always premising however, that we hold which we may now or hereafter say against him, and at the same time apologizing to the public for ever having said any thing favorable of one who has proved himself any thing but a gentleman.

On our first page will be found a correspondence between ourselves and Judge CLAYTON, which we copy from the Milledgeville Journal, where it appears with a short introductory note from Judge C. His object in publishing this correspondence, appears to have been to show that we once considered the Judge an honorable man, but he forgets that in proving this very unimportant fact, he clearly demonstrates to the public that we were wrong in our estimate of his character, and that he is really as unworthy of the confidence of a gentleman, as he is undeserving the title. Of the letters in question, we have no cause to be ashamed—there is not a sentiment in them we would desire to change, and considering that they were hasty, *confidential* communications, not even looked over after being penned, we are well satisfied with the style in which they are edited. But what earthly excuse can there be offered for Judge CLAYTON's breach of confidence? What gentleman, or

even what worthless and unprincipled fellow, claiming to be considered a gentleman, would presume to give to the public a confidential correspondence of which he had said, "*I shall strictly regard the confidence which you have voluntarily placed in me.*"? But what makes the moral turpitude of this man still greater, is the fact that he returned this confidential letter, and at the same time surreptitiously preserved a *copy of it* which he now makes public! Nor is this all; when the *confidential* letter was withdrawn because this high-minded and honorable man thought it might embarrass him, it was replaced by a *public* one of precisely the same import, which he very prudently suppresses in his publication! We repeat we are perfectly satisfied that the correspondence is before the public. If he had asked our consent to publish, it would most cheerfully have been extended to him; but this is no palliation for his dishonorable conduct in retaining a copy of a letter which he returned by request, and afterwards giving publicity to it. No one having any of the feelings of a gentleman could have been *guilty* of such base conduct.

Judge CLAYTON and Mr. CAMBRELENG had both distinctly exonerated the Courier and Enquirer from all censure in our loans from the Bank of the United States, and it was evident to Mr. NOAH and ourself that if we could persuade them to state frankly in their report, their opinion of these loans, it would be reducing the whole controversy to simply the loan from Burrows to Noah for which Mr. Biddle had furnished the funds to Burrows. We knew that that loan had been made to Burrows upon his introduction to Mr. Biddle by the late venerable ex-President MONROE, and that Burrows' wealth would be an abundant warranty for Mr. Biddle's having made him even a much larger loan. This view of the subject also presented itself to Messrs. CLAYTON and CAMBRELENG, and consequently they refused to do us the justice to express in their report the opinions which personally, in presence of a third party,

they had distinctly and unequivocally avowed.

A few days after the false report of Judge CLAYTON written by Mr. CAMBRELENG, appeared, ROBERT MORRIS, Esq, of the 15th May last, we published the following extract :

“ Do you not remember the afternoon we visited Judge CLAYTON in company? *The Judge distinctly said that the examination (your examination,) had completely exonerated the Courier & Enquirer and its Editors from all suspicion of culpability.* He said he was rejoiced to see you in order that he might say so, in consequence of some difficulty which had occurred between you and him in the committee room, and to which he then alluded. I remember the conversation distinctly, and was surprised with that on my memory, to find so *garbled and unwarranted* a statement of your transactions with the Bank in the Report.

“ Should you have occasion to use my name in connection with that conversation and in contrast with the report, do so without hesitation.”

In reply to this letter, written without our solicitation, we enquired of our correspondent whether he recollected what passed at an interview with Colo. JOHNSON after our examination, and received the following reply, which we also published on the 15th of May.

PHILADELPHIA, May 10, 1832.

DEAR WEBB—

“ Your favor came to hand yesterday. I remember very distinctly the conversation that took place during our visit to Judge CLAYTON and Col. JOHNSON. The former appeared delighted to see you—apologised for some improper question put to you during the examination the previous morning, and expressed himself as *decidedly convinced of your innocence of the charge that had been preferred against you.* I remember having been much pleased with the manner of the Judge, so frank and *apparently* honourable—so explanatory of the course he had pursued as one of the committee, and so satisfactory to yourself. It was on this account that I was the more astonished on reading that passage of the Bank Report in which the Courier and Enquirer was referred to. My impression was, from the conversation of Judge Clayton, that instead of pointing out your case in the Report as one of doubt and suspicion, that so far as the Judge had influence and

Hook and  
\$225; of  
and Del  
hose car  
expense  
chasing  
adopted  
A con  
definite  
for the  
resoluti  
Reso  
the pay  
structio  
Whitin  
Reso  
immed  
for the  
On u  
red to  
The  
Fro  
Tresc  
the 15  
Amste  
was on  
ult.  
off at  
the sh  
health  
an enc  
any v  
ly she  
ed to  
rived a  
ed aw  
Tresc  
forthw  
a quar  
of hea  
The  
not all  
nean t  
Cap  
Cadiz  
or rela

“ Judge CLAYTON and Col. JOHNSON. The former appeared  
“ delighted to see you—apologised for some improper question  
“ put to you during the examination the previous morning, and  
“ expressed himself as *decidedly convinced of your inno-*  
“ *cence of the charge that had been preferred against you.*  
“ I remember having been much pleased with the manner of the  
“ Judge, so frank and *apparently* honourable—so explanatory  
“ of the course he had pursued as one of the committee, and so  
“ satisfactory to yourself. It was on this account that I was  
“ the more astonished on reading that passage of the Bank Re-  
“ port in which the Courier and Enquirer was referred to. My  
“ impression was, from the conversation of Judge Clayton, that  
“ instead of pointing out your case in the Report as one of doubt  
“ and suspicion, that so far as the Judge had influence and  
“ agency, it would be omitted altogether, or if mentioned, re-  
“ ferred to solely for the purpose of removing the insinuations  
“ that had been made against you. His language and manner—  
“ the whole tenor of his conversation, induced this inference.

“ You will remember how warmly I spoke of the Judge before  
“ we saw him on the occasion referred to—and you cannot for-  
“ get how that warmth of approbation was continued after the  
“ interview. Under these circumstances therefore, I confess  
“ that it does seem remarkable that the Report should assume  
“ so different a character, especially with regard to your exami-  
“ nation, from that which one of its supposed authors led us to  
“ expect.

“ And leaving Judge Clayton we stepped into the room of  
“ Col. Johnson. The Colonel was less communicative upon  
“ the subject of the Bank than the Judge—said he considered  
“ it “ *pretty much a New York fight,*” or something to that  
“ effect, and asked if he should ring for Mr. Cambreleng.—  
“ After some other unimportant conversation, and with the ex-  
“ pectation that the conversation between Mr. C. and yourself  
“ would be of a somewhat private nature and connected with  
“ New York politics, I left you.

\* \* \* \* \*

“ I did not understand the conversation that took place be-  
“ tween the Judge and yourself as by any means of a private  
“ or confidential character, and so repeated immediately to  
“ more of your friends here, without mentioning the name of  
“ the Judge, that the examination of Mr. Webb had completely  
“ vindicated the Courier and Enquirer.”

Yours Respectfully,  
ROBERT MORRIS.

We now leave A. S. CLAYTON with all his well merited fame, to the judgment of the public. If that public agree with us, they will say, he stands convicted of *deliberate falsehood*—of *dishonorably* retaining a copy of a letter which he had returned to the writer to be destroyed—of betraying private confidence—and of suppressing the only part of the correspondence which was intended for the public eye.—They will say that all these things prove A. S. CLAYTON to be a worthless *poltroon* and as unworthy a seat in Congress as he is of the title of gentleman. At all events we say all these complimentary things of this man, and they are equally applicable to those who have republished the private correspondence.