

From the Washington Globe.

WEBB'S LETTER OF CONFESSION.

The Editor of the National (Bank) Gazette is exceedingly vexed at Mr. Clayton, of Georgia, for publishing what he calls Webb's "confidential deprecatory letter." The pangs are certainly not for Webb, but for Mr. Biddle. The Editor truly says, "we are not defending Mr. Webb," but nevertheless he assails, most violently, Judge Clayton, for merely publishing Webb's letter in self-vindication, against subsequent false imputations on the part of the writer of the letter, which the publication of his correspondence was necessary to expose. The Editor of the Gazette seems to think that Judge Clayton ought to have permitted Webb to impeach his motives as a member of the Bank Committee, publicly, and to retain unpublished in his possess-

ion, complete proof, under Webb's own hand, showing that he did not believe his own accusation. This would, we think be giving rather too sacred a character to the confidential confessions of the culprit, however "deprecatory." It was mere generosity in Judge Clayton that induced him not to take advantage of Webb's indiscretion, at first. In addressing entreaties to Judge Clayton, with a view to swerve him from his official duty, Webb had no right to expect any thing from him but instant exposure. But when he ventured to traduce the motives of the man whose humanity had generously spared him, and undertook to disparage him in these very particulars in relation to which his private correspondence gave a different testimony, had he a right to expect that his private admissions would not, under such circumstances, be brought forth to confront his public declarations? When Webb, by his own voluntary act, had given to the party whose character he assailed, the means of defeating a new wrong which he sought to commit, it would be a strange delicacy in the person thus abused, to keep secret one confessed offence, to enable the wrong-doer to commit another. But the Editor of the Bank Gazette professes to hold Webb's secret acts inviolable, merely as screening his new overt acts of mischief. Mr. Clayton has done nothing more than make a traducer, who was bearing false witness against him, convict himself; and this, our man of Bank "ethics" tells Mr. Clayton, is "to palter" with Mr. Webb—to practise "gross deception" on him—"to entrap and beguile" to be guilty of "mockery and perfidy." He holds Webb's letter as confidential and to be improperly published, and says, that "confidential letters may be regarded as stolen as soon as published;" and further, that "the embezzlement of deposits of money would not more distress or injure the owners." (Mr. Walsh as well as some of his patrons, consider this "embezzlement" a very light offence.)

Mr. Walsh then, thus attacks the Globe, which he accuses of having "directly published" the correspondence:

"Stolen letters, whatever may be their contents, reflect as much disgrace upon those who purloined, as those who wrote them; and the publisher of them, knowing them to have been stolen, is as bad as the thief."

To the charge as made by this Editor, we give a "direct contradiction." We did not "directly" publish the correspondence. We copied it from the Georgia Journal, as Webb himself has done—and yet this poor blockhead after republishing the private correspondence himself, says that "those who have republished it" are "worthless patroons," "and unwoorthy the title of a gentleman."—What singular stupidity, not to be able to distinguish between his own character and that of others, who happen to follow his example in indifferent matters!!

The point in this developement, which gives pain to Webb, is not that which distresses his co-adjutor of the Bank Gazette. The latter says "there are sentences in his (Webb's) first letter, which he must find it difficult to explain away." We take the following to be one of these lapses—Webb says in his letter to Mr. Clayton:

"MAKE WHAT YOU WILL OF MR. BIDDLE'S GIVING \$15,000 TO BE LOANED TO NOAH; BUT SAY NOTHING OF OUR PRIVATE BUSINESS." "THE LOAN WAS MADE BY BURROWS TO NOAH, NOT TO ME OR TO THE PAPER."

Does not this account pretty satisfactorily, how it happened that Mr. Biddle took this money out of his pocket and gave it to Burrows without consulting the Board of Disectors? And for his taking Mr. Burrows's word of mouth merely, as he tells us, for security?—For nine months this HEAVY LOAN, from the Bank, as it was pretended, was not noted on the Bank books—why? Mr. Webb now tells us it was GIVEN TO MR. BURROWS TO LOAN. Upon what terms and conditions?—This Mr. Burrows absconded from the process of the Committee to avoid telling. But it was given to him and his word was the security;—for what? That the \$15,000 should effect "the change in the course of the Courier and Enquirer;" that Mr. Webb promised might be effected for that sum. But when the Congressional investigation was threatened, this crim. con. transaction, after being dormant for nine months, was brought to light from Mr. Biddle's breech pocket, and laid at the door of the Bank; and the kind foundling Hospital adopted this "fair business transaction," as one of its own offspring.—Webb may call it "fair," the country will never consider it legitimate.