

From the Lexington Reporter.

DISMISSAL OF JACKSON.

In 1770 when an application was made to Lord North to alter the hostile system adopted towards America, he replied, "It is in vain to make objection—the king will not have it so! His majesty is determined to try the question with America."

And "his majesty" did try it, exactly in the same style as he will try it again if he recurs to open arms.

Our object in stating this fact, is, to draw the attention of our fellow-citizens to the real and true foundation of all our differences with G. Britain. We have generally been looking forward to the different changes in the British ministry for a palliation to our wrongs, but we have seen, that let whatever alterations take place, let who will be minister, the same insults are continued. This, therefore, proves that there is some fundamental hostility. And we are persuaded that it is in the bosom of the British Tyrant—and that whilst he lives and rules, there will be only modifications of attack on our independence in all the changes he may make of his ministers.

This consideration is now become of the highest interest to us, since the dismissal of Jackson—and also the consideration of the character of his present ministers.—Are they men who are to be expected to pass by without resentment the rejecting of their ambassador?

The more we reflect, the more are we persuaded that this will not be the case. Jackson, there is no doubt, had instructions from his government, to assert what he did. Canning gave the lie to Mr. Madison and his colleagues, whilst debating in the British common; and Jackson only repeated the orders of his ster. In proportion therefore as his insolence was encouraged by armor submissions, in proportion will be the rage of that ministry on being foiled in their most desperate attempt to put the last finishing blow to our independence.—And reasoning on the conduct of Congress, we must be persuaded that in proportion as they must now see that former concessions encouraged this last insult, will be their energy in future to make atonement to themselves and fellow-citizens, by the most energetic and decided stand. Our hand is now put to the plough—we cannot recede. And however much many of our citizens may have slid into apathy and indifference from being habituated to submission, we are persuaded that nothing is required to recal back the energy which was exhibited two years past but the voice of Congress.

Ever since the peace of 1783, there has not been a single circumstance on our part in which the British government could even pretend to charge us with being the aggressors—every act of injustice has been with them—and when with all our patience they have been guilty of such violations and cruelties, can it be expected but that party with their king, who are for war with the United States, will not seize with avidity to rouse the British nation, already prejudiced against us, to consent to direct hostilities? No act is so likely to have this effect as the rejecting of an ambassador, a degradation which we believe has not ever before been offered to, or experienced by that nation—and for this reason will have the tendency to the very step which could have been desired to render a war with us palatable in the present situation of England.

This decisive step on our part must therefore, in our opinion, have the effect of consolidating and combining our disputes; for it is impossible for us to recede—and, as we before said, we are persuaded that the present British ministry will not—they denied and disowned Erskine's instructions to answer their purposes, but they will not disgrace Jackson. He was sent here purposely to bully and insult. He has not, we are certain, exceeded his instructions. But we question if either Jackson or his masters expected the consequences, and the firmness of our government.

This affair happening on the moment of the meeting of Congress, is

particularly favorable, as it will give the opportunity of taking immediately every step necessary for defence, and strengthening the hands of the administration, and there cannot be a doubt but the first mails after the commencement of the session, will announce the most decided measures, and preparation to meet the resentment of the British government.

We repeat that we deprecate war as the greatest evil which could befall the United States—we will not look back and reflect on the forbearance of different administrations, convinced that forbearance was solely occasioned by their solicitude for peace—but had some such decided step been before taken, say, on the Chesapeake murders, we do believe that there would have been less prospect of direct war than now.

SKETCHES FROM MR. GILES' SPEECH.

The first, and as yet the only speech delivered in the present congress, was by Mr. Giles, of the senate, on the rupture with Mr. Jackson. Cautious in his premises, his conclusions are such as naturally flow from facts, and strike conviction to every understanding. To insert it entire would almost exclusively occupy our columns; we cannot, however, refuse ourselves the pleasure of preserving in the Watchman a few extracts from his observations.

The object of the remarks was to elucidate the expediency and propriety of a declaration from congress approving of the conduct of the executive, relative to Mr. Jackson. He considered the expression of this opinion due to the people, who have the deepest interest in the government—due to the Executive, who should know whether, with the cooperation of congress, he might continue to assert our right, or with shame or confusion retrace his steps; due, imperiously due, to the dignity of congress, whose duty forbade them to stand aloof; and above all, due to the United States as a nation, that the congressional will should be proclaimed upon this delicate and important occasion.

The consequences of indecision and commotion are next described. "I have no hesitation," says he, "in saying, and with pain at heart I shall be compelled to shew it in the course of this debate, that in my judgment, our present embarrassments are too much to be ascribed to our former manifestation of indecision, to our unfortunate dissensions and divisions. Sir, whenever I approach this sorrowful and awful subject, my heart feels as if it were bleeding at every pore, when I am compelled to reflect, and to believe that this, our beloved country, may shortly become a bleeding victim, from wounds—if not inflicted by the hands of her own sons, at least by their unhappy divisions and dissensions."

He next looks for what patriotism, for what a love of country dictates on the occasion, and observes, "it is time for opinion to pause and reflect, whether any consequences can be worse, or more disgraceful, than joining a foreign against its country's standard? Whether it would not be better, more patriotic, more virtuous to support your country even in a supposed unwise course of policy, than to join a foreign standard, and use it to correct and change the course of policy thus disapproved."

Mr. Giles next proceeds to analyze the correspondence between the secretary of state, Mr. Erskine and Mr. Jackson. This is done in that masterly manner the grossness and turpitude of the insult so clearly demanded, that the lips of even Pickering and the most shameless apologists, of Jackson were sealed in silence on the subject.

The disavowal of Mr. Erskine's arrangement is also the subject of a few remarks.—After receiving, attentively and impartially, the whole correspondence—after the most careful consideration of past and passing events, the only conclusion which could be consistently drawn, was, that Mr. Erskine did not exceed his instructions. A part of Mr. Giles' observations are as follow.

"No, Sir the want of powers on the part of Mr. Erskine, is not the true cause of the disavowal. I will now venture to conjecture the true cause; and if it be the right one, the case will be a plain one; and all equivocations in the explanations rendered unnecessary.

"To do this, Sir, I must call your attention to the state of events in Europe and in the United States, at these different periods of time.—Mr. Oakley's mission was immediately after the British government was apprised of the precipitate retreat of

Sir John Moore's army from Spain, and the fortunate escape of the remains of it from Corunna.—The affairs of Spain, which had before excited such high expectations in the British cabinet, were given up as hopeless. &c. &c.—Contemporaneously with a knowledge of these events, the British government was also informed of the measures of resistance against her outrageous aggressions, contemplated by congress; which she then believed would certainly be carried into effect, &c. &c. Such was the state of things at the time of sending the dispatches by Mr. Oakley. At the time of the disavowal, a new coalition had been formed, Austria had boldly entered into the war against France, and the Spaniards had been animated into further efforts of resistance, which excited new hopes of success, &c.

"In this country, too, sir, it pains my heart to be compelled to recite the circumstances; our contemplated measures of resistance had been relaxed, and the whole country exhibited such scenes of divisions and disaffection as paralysed in some degree the movements of the government. I wish, sir, I could throw a shade of oblivion over these unfortunate scenes or recollect them only, as they furnish the strongest argument. Indeed, sir, they point with an infallible index to the course it now becomes us to pursue. Yes, sir, it is to these changes in the state of things, you are to look for the real causes of the disavowal, and not to the want of competent instructions on the part of Mr. Erskine, and it would have been more dignified on the part of the British government to have told us so at once. She would then have said to us, the state of things are changed—at the time of giving the instructions, I was depressed from a combination of untoward events—I am now flushed with new hopes of elevation and of triumph—Besides you have convinced me that you are untrue to yourselves—that you will shrink from the assertion and support of your own rights—if you will, I am not bound to respect them, &c. I was then down, I am now up, and therefore I cannot grant you, in a spirit of triumph, what I solemnly promised in a spirit of despondency—I now find this the most favorable moment for establishing my favorite doctrine of the despotism of the ocean; and I cannot, and will not deprive myself of the advantage merely to avoid the imputation of bad faith."

Having completed his strictures on the correspondence with Mr. Jackson, Mr. Giles enquires, "Is there one single gentleman in the United States, with an American heart in his bosom, who could wish to see his government and his country placed in so degrading a situation? And what prospect of benefit could there be to the United States, in proceeding with a negotiation conducted with such a spirit of hostility and superciliousness on the part of the British negotiator? Is there a gentleman whose highest sensibilities are not excited by this insolent conduct of the British minister? and whose judgment is not convinced of the propriety of the conduct of his own government? And, sir, after all these outrageous and premeditated insults, what is the measure proposed by the executive in relation to this contumacious minister? Why, sir, the mildest in the whole vocabulary of expedients.—Simply to refuse to receive any further communications from him, and to request his recall by his own government; and in the mean time, to receive communications through any other channel.—Thus merely shielding itself from further insults, and manifesting a solicitude for friendly intercourse with Great Britain, which must shield it from every imputation of insincerity in its professions of friendly views in relation to that government. Yes, sir, negotiation is still open although in my judgment without the smallest probability of success or advantage. Upon the whole review of this part of the subject then, sir, is there a gentleman, who is not prepared to say, that in refusing to receive any further communications from Mr. Jackson, the executive government has manifested a just regard to its own dignity and honor, as well as to the character and interests of the American people? And can there be a gentleman of this senate who is not prepared to pledge himself to stand by and support the executive government in this respect to the last extremity?"

Upwards of three columns in strictures on Mr. Jackson's "Circular," or appeal to the people, form another division of Mr. Giles' speech. He infers that congress cannot pass it without notice. "If this most aggravated case should pass over unnoticed, I should not be surprised to

see Mr. Jackson, during the present winter, set himself up as a British president in New York, contesting the point of jurisdiction before the people, with the American president at Washington—whilst congress, regardless of their own constitutional powers—should stand by and behold the scene in a state of perfect neutrality. Sir, is it possible, that congress can so far forget their duties to the people, and their respect for themselves?"

Mr. Giles then concluded with the following impressive sentence:

"Union is all that is wanting to make us happy and victorious. Why then, sir, should we not have union since it is so easy and efficacious a remedy for all our difficulties? Sir, the nation expects it; the nation has a right to demand it. May I not then hope, sir, that the hitherto dominant spirit of party will now yield to an occasion, so obvious, so urgent and so honorable. Sir, I cannot express to you the pleasure I should feel in my heart, if I could see all irritations banished, and harmony and mutual good will universally pervading all political scenes and all social intercourse. That the present occasion may be improved to this desirable end, is the most fervent prayer of one, who, in the present delicate, interesting crisis of the nation, feels a devotion for his country beyond every thing else on this side of heaven!"

Watchman.

FROM THE BOSTON CHRONICLE.

The Documents brought to a focus:—or a short examination of our situation with Britain.

The controversy between the U. States and Great Britain is confined within a very narrow compass, and though the subject may be confounded in a multiplicity of words, yet the question remains in all its aggravations, in a plain concise point of view. The fact is simply this,—the government of the United States having adopted a system of commercial restrictions for the sole purpose of securing the commerce of its citizens from the capture and depredations of the belligerents, the British nation sent over to their minister to make propositions for the removal of all embarrassments as it respected their intercourse with us. The minister was apparently invested with all those powers for the fulfilment of his engagements, that are commonly given to a plenipotentiary from the most respectable powers in Europe. He was accredited by the President in this character, and whatever was done by him, was considered done by his majesty, George the third. Mr. Erskine, in a diplomatic point of view, was the immediate agent of the British government. All the powers of the nation were consolidated in him.—He was in fact, King, Lords and Commons, as it related to this negotiation. His decisions were their veto; and the nation was as much bound to comply with his engagements, as if all his doings were under the direction of an act of parliament expressly for that purpose. In this view of the business, with all its sanctions, pledges and confirmations, the president enters into an agreement to remove all the embarrassments complained of by the British, and place the whole commerce of the United States upon the honor and integrity of the nation, with whom he had sacredly negotiated.

But here "hangs a tale." After every thing had been done on our part that was stipulated; after we had repealed all our embargo laws, on the pledged faith of Britain—after we had acted on principles of honor to the utmost extent of our power—the British nation disavows the whole procedure; recalls the minister who transacted the business, and sends out another, who on the very first entering upon the subject, not only disowns the previous contracts, but insists on further impositions on our commerce, and insolently gives the lie to the very Constituted Authorities, with whom their former minister had negotiated!

The history of diplomacy does not produce a more aggravated detail of national perfidy.—All the civilized nations of the world must reprobate the conduct of Britain; no apology can be allowed her, as the agreement between the two countries was openly and unequivocally acceded to upon the basis of national faith, and official responsibility. The U. States were firmly bound to fulfil every iota of the contract, and England was equally bound on her part:—on failure of a complete accomplishment of the whole agreement, the aggressing party must be viewed in the eyes of all civilized nations, as destitute of honour, deficient in public faith, and whose word can never hereafter be ta-

ken as a pledge of integrity or sincerity.

It is proper that the documents attached to this business should be published; but after we have read and read them over and over again, the whole question stands in this simple attitude before the public. It is a violation of the faith of Britain, and a gross imposition on the honesty and sincerity of the American government.

The President stands honorably before all nations as conducting the business on fair and equitable principles, and must be viewed by all the world as acting with the greatest propriety during this important transaction. The conduct of Britain is interesting to Europe, for, if ministers cannot be trusted in their negotiations with foreign powers, the whole system of diplomacy must hereafter become null and void: And if this fails, there cannot be any exertion for national honor or responsibility.

The United States therefore can never stand upon more substantial ground with respect to its controversy with Britain, than on the violation of the pledged faith of Britain in her transactions through Mr. Erskine. The world will applaud our conduct, if it carries the mark of indignant resentment. All Europe must aid us in our controversy, as they are interested in vindicating the inviolability of diplomatic engagements. Our measures therefore ought to be spirited, for even the honorable part of the British nation must condemn the perfidy of their ministry. If Britain has deceived us by Erskine and Jackson, what can we expect from any farther negotiation? It is impossible they can give more sanctity to another minister than to their former, and it is in vain for us to look for more integrity in the British cabinet, unless we ENFORCE IT BY THE ENERGY OF OUR MEASURES.

FROM THE ALBANY REGISTER.

ENGLAND'S VIRTUE, JUSTICE, CONSTITUTION.—

"It will be happy if the change in this respect, should be accompanied by a favorable revision of the unfriendly policy which has been so long pursued towards the United States." [President's Message, 27th Nov. 1869.]

What just hopes we may entertain of this happy and favorable revision of British policy towards the United States, let the conduct of the ministerial party upon an effort of the few Britons who represent the people in the house of Commons, to expose and punish the principal officers of state for the most corrupt violation of morality and the constitution, decide. No person will deny the proposition, that the house of Commons is the most free, popular, virtuous, substantial, boasted and noble department of the British government; in this all their writers and admirers agree. And if the apothegms of Lords Brougham, Hale and president Montesquieu, (which no Englishmen will question) are true, the following statement evinces that England's glory, liberty and constitution are no more, and that the subjects of that unhappy kingdom are left without all manner of remedy.

On the 11th May, 1869, Mr. Madocks, one of the House of Commons, in order to institute an enquiry to eventuate in an impeachment, or a petition to the crown, after a preface, reciting former resolutions of the house, and a number of other facts of corruption, well known and undenied, pronounced; "I affirm then, that Mr. Dick purchased a seat in this house for the borough of Caskeel through the agency of the Hon. Henry Wellesley, Esq. who acted for and in behalf of the treasury; that upon a recent question (respecting the Duke of York) of the last importance, when Mr. Dick, had determined to vote according to his conscience, the noble Lord (Castlereagh) did intigrate to that gentleman the necessity of either his voting with the government or resigning his seat in that house; and that Mr. Dick, sooner than vote against principle, did make choice of the latter alternative, and did vacate his seat accordingly. To this transaction, I charge the right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Percival, chancellor of the Exchequer) as being privy, and having connived at it; this I will engage to prove by witnesses at your bar; if the house will give me leave to call them."

To this charge, the Chancellor of the Exchequer declined putting in any plea, and stated, that, as well as he understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madock) he intimated in the opening of his charges, that there was still behind them a mass of other matter; and indeed that that intimation had been sufficiently illustrated in the detailed statements entered in to by the hon. gentleman, respecting