

Remarks of the editors of the Richmond Enquirer on a communication signed *Pendleton*, inserted in the paper of the 18th ult.

*Pendleton* will excuse us for accompanying his Essay with a very few suggestions.

He is disposed to believe that Dr. Abbot "received this suggestion from Mr. Crawford himself." Admit the fact; and what follows? Is it any wonder that Dr. A. could believe the paragraph to be "spurious?"—That all the friends of Mr C. who knew the uniform consistency of his opinions, should believe it so? That Mr C. himself should suspect it to be so? that he who had been a republican; had acted with the republican party—could trace nothing in his whole course to tally with such a sentiment—should when near 25 years had passed away doubt in the strongest manner that he could ever have acquiesced in a paper that breathed such a sentiment? Is it proper on such a ground, to throw out a reflection on the honor of Mr C.—to assume that the "forgetfulness of Mr C." was only "artful?" But, though it does appear from Maj. Watkins's letter that the "draft reported by the committee underwent some trivial and merely verbal alterations in general committee," how does it follow that Mr. C. either *drafted* or *dictated* it? that he was in the meeting when these alterations were adopted? that he assented to the facts as stated in the Address, or to the course of its reasoning?—Suppose he did agree to take the whole Address as it was, suppose the other republicans present consented to adopt the same alternative, rather than withdraw altogether from the meeting, are we to pronounce from this one miscalculation alone, that they were all federalists?

The whole question is, in truth, in a nutshell. How stands the argument? On the one hand, is a sentiment in an Address to which it does not appear that Mr C. ever did assent—on the other, the whole course of his political life, whilst he was in the state of Georgia—as attested by friends and foes—the evidence of Watkins and M'Kinzie—uniform federalists—the evidence of Clayton, of Barnett, of Moore, of Abbot, &c. &c.—the evidence of all the Georgia papers, save one only, which though dared and defied to produce a single fact or a single witness, still continues to repeat its little cuckoo note of "Augusta Address, Augusta Addresses." We have had the fact of Crawford's vote for A. Baldwin in '98, when every federalist voted against him—we have his own election by the republican legislature of Georgia—we have his intimate associations and action with Baldwin and Jackson and Peter Early, than whom bolder and firmer republicans were not to be found in Georgia. In fact, on the one hand, we have a most equivocal piece of evidence—and on the other, a mass of testimony which is clear and indisputable.

*Pendleton*, it is true, takes some exception to the character we have given to three of these witnesses. He is pleased to call it *ruff*; but an epithet cannot *ruff* away the character which these men deserve. We did speak in high terms of Clayton and Moore and Watkins. We spoke on the information of a gentleman of this city (a man of honor) who knows them all, and described them as we spoke.—If *Pendleton* has any doubts about them, let him ask our respected countryman, James P. Preston, who was last year an U. S. Commissioner in Georgia, and who speaks of these men as we have spoken.

It is true that Maj. Watkins plays upon Mr. Jefferson's expression—and adds that "it would seem as if we were now all federalists all republicans." But does Maj. W. even insinuate it could have been true in '98. Does he not positively say that he "ever" thought and that "it has always been considered in (Mr C.) never belonged to what is termed the Federal party?"

How can *Pendleton* say that "Judge Clayton's certificate is of the argumentative kind?" Surely, not altogether so—for, Judge C. positively affirms that "the individual testimony of Maj. Watkins can be supported by a thousand living witnesses." Is this argument—or is it testimony of the strongest kind?—Nay, even *Pendleton* himself fails to notice or to answer the strong part of the argument in this very certificate.