

In all discussions between Government and Government whatever may be the differences of opinion on the facts or principles brought into view, the invariable rule of courtesy and justice demands that the sincerity of the opposing party in the views which it entertains should never be called in question. Facts may be denied, deductions examined, disproved and condemned, without just cause of offence; but no impeachment of the integrity of the Government in its reliance on the correctness of its own views, can be permitted, without a total forgetfulness of self-respect. In the sentence quoted from M. Serurier's letter, no exception is taken to the assertion that the complaints of this Government are founded upon allegations entirely inexact, nor upon that which declares the explanations given, here or at Paris, appeared not to have left even the possibility of a misunderstanding on such delicate points. The correctness of these assertions we shall allow to dispute; and while the records of the two Governments endure, we shall find no difficulty in showing that they are groundless; but when M. Serurier chooses to qualify the non-accomplishment of the engagements made by France, to which the President refers, as a pretended non-accomplishment, he conveys the idea that the Chief Magistrate knows or believes, that he is in error, and, acting upon this known error, seeks to impose it upon Congress and the world as truth. In this sense, it is a direct attack upon the integrity of the Chief Magistrate of the Republic. As such it must be indignantly repelled; and it being a question of moral delinquency between the two Governments, the evidence against France, by whom it is raised, must be sternly arrayed. You will ascertain, therefore, if it has been used by the authority, or receives the sanction of the Government of France in that sense. Should it be disavowed or explained, as from the note of the Count de Rigny to you, written at the moment of great excitement, and in its matter not differing from M. Serurier's, it is presumed it will, by you, then use the materials herewith communicated, or already in your power, in a temper of great forbearance but with a firmness of tone not to be mistaken to answer the substance of the note itself.

M. Serurier to Mr. Forsyth.

WASHINGTON, February 23, 1835.

The undersigned, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of the French, at Washington, has received orders to present the following note to the Secretary of State of the Government of the United States.

It would be superfluous to say that the message addressed on the 1st of December, 1834, to the Congress of the United States, by President Jackson, was received at Paris with a sentiment of painful surprise.

The King's Government is far from supposing that the measures recommended in this message to the attention of Congress, can be adopted (voluntarily) by that Assembly; but even considering the document in question as a mere manifestation of the opinion which the President wishes to express, with regard to the course taken in this affair, it is impossible not to consider its publication as a fact of a most serious nature.

The complaints brought forward by the President, on account of the pretended non-fulfillment of the engagements entered into by the King's Government after the vote of the 1st of April, are strange, not only from the total inaccuracy of the allegations on which they are based, but, also, because the explanations received by Mr. Livingston, at Paris, and those which the undersigned has given directly to the cabinet of Washington, seemed not to leave the slightest possibility of misunderstanding on points so balde.

It appeared indeed, from these explanations, that although the session of the French Chambers, which was opened on the 31st of July last, in compliance with an express provision of the charter was prorogued at the end of a fortnight, before the bill relative to the American claims, announced in the discourse from the throne, could be placed under discussion, this prorogation arose (tradit) entirely from the absolute impossibility of commencing at so premature a period the legislative labors belonging to the year 1835.

It also appeared that the motives which had hindered the formal presentation to the Chambers of the bill in question, during this first space of a fortnight, originated chiefly in the desire more effectually to secure the success of this important affair, by choosing the most opportune moment of offering it to the deliberations of the Deputies newly elected, who perhaps might have been unfavorably impressed, by this unusual haste in submitting it to them so long before the period at which they could enter upon an examination of it.

The undersigned will add, that it is moreover difficult to comprehend what advantage could have resulted from such a measure, since it could not evidently have produced the effect which the President declares that he had in view, of enabling him to state, at the opening of Congress, that these long-pending negotiations were definitively closed. The President supposes, it is true, that the Chambers might have been called together anew before the last month of 1834; but even though the session had been opened some months earlier, which, for several reasons, would have been impossible, the simplest calculation will serve to show that in no case could the decision of the Chambers have been taken, much less made known at Washington, before the 1st of December.

The King's Government had a right (devoir) to believe that considerations so striking would have proved convincing with the cabinet of the United States, and the more so as no direct communication made to the undersigned by this cabinet, or transmitted at Paris by Mr. Livingston, had given token of the irritation and misunderstanding which the message of December 1 has thus deplorably revealed; and as Mr. Livingston, with that judicious spirit which characterizes him, coinciding with the system of (menagemens) precautions and temporizing pence, adopted by the cabinet of the Tuilleries, with a view to the common interests, had even requested, at the moment of the meeting of the Chambers, that the presentation of the bill in question might be deferred, in order that its discussion should not be mingled with debates of another nature, with which its coincidence might place it in juxtaposition.

This last obstacle had just been removed, and the bill was about to be presented to the Chamber of Deputies, when the arrival of the message, by creating in the minds of all a degree of astonishment at least equal to the just irritation which it could not fail to produce, has forced the Government of the King to deliberate on the part which it had to adopt.

Strong in its own right and dignity, it did not conceive that the inexplicable act of the President ought to cause it to renounce, absolutely, a determination, the origin of which had been its respect for engagements (loyaute) and its good feelings towards a friendly nation. Although it does not conceal from itself that the provocation given at Washington has materially increased the difficulties of the case, already so great, yet it has determined to ask from the Chambers an appropriation of twenty-five millions, to meet the engagements of the treaty of July 4.

But His Majesty has at the same time resolved no longer to expose his minister to hear such language as that held on December 1. The undersigned has received orders to return to France, and the despatch of this order has been made known to Mr. Livingston.

The undersigned has the honor to present to the Secretary of State the assurance of his high consideration.

SERURIER.

To the Hon. JOHN FORSYTH, Secretary of State.

From the Richmond Enquirer. JOHN C. CALHOUN.

"Breaths there a wretch, to shame so dead, Who never to himself hath said, This is my own, my native land!" It could scarcely be believed that the anomaly in human nature, so beautifully and poetically delineated in the above lines, could be found to exist in the eighteenth century.—Of all places in the world for the exhibition of such a monstrous development of human feeling, the heart of an American citizen, would be the last place we should look for it, and what is still more extraordinary, the American Senate, the forum where such a development should be made. What man—what American, but must blush for the honor of human nature, and for the character of his own countrymen, who has read the speech of John C. Calhoun, lately delivered in the Senate of the United States, on the reception of the special message of the President upon the subject of our affairs with France; and what high-minded, honorable, and patriotic bosom, but must burn with indignation, to see an American Senator in his place, uttering a string of the most unblushing calumnies against the Executive (taking part with France, and justifying her in every step taken during a negotiation, where on one side, all was fair, honorable, and open—on the other, treacherous, quibbling, and deceitful. What member of the Chamber of Deputies—what of the House of Peers, could have made a speech from the tribune, more completely national and Anti-American, than Mr. Calhoun has done in the American Senate.—Even Gen. Valze, the author of the amendment in the House of Peers, to the bill of indemnity, requiring an apology from our Government, could not have selected a more suitable theme, or culled a choicer set of phrases calculated to throw odium on the American people and government, than Mr. C. has done in the speech alluded to. And who is it that thus buckles on his armor in favor of France, even before the war has begun?—Who is it that thus denounces his own Government for not yielding to a demand compromising the honor of his country, and rendering us contemptible in the eyes of all Europe, the laughing stock of the World?—John C. Calhoun—Once Vice President of the Republic would disparage, and a member of the highest body assembled under our Constitution, to see "that the same Republic receives no detriment"—The same individual who owes all the fame, and glory, and honor he once possessed, to the noble and brave stand he took upon another occasion, when England, with much more power, and with less provocation, was trampling on our rights and insulting our flag.—The same John C. Calhoun, who in another branch of our National Legislature, was uttering "thoughts that breathed, and words that burned" in behalf of the honor, the interests and the glory of his country.

"What should be in that Caesar?"—The answer is easy—his hopes are blasted—his expectations defeated—he is another memorable example in the history of Statesmen in all ages, who when they have failed to accomplish the objects of their ambition, desert the party, and left the ranks of their friends, have become traitors to the cause, and characters of public opinion, of their former high standing and character—of all that an honorable man should covet—the reputation for consistency—the estimation of their fellow men; their own high and elevated position—the "Dugald Dalgetty" they become the "free companions" of Opposition—the "Swiss" of any party—for pay or applause, as either a vice, or vanity, in advanced age may have the predominant—a melancholy illustration of the proverb, "Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat."

From the Globe. We learn that estimates have been sent by the War Department to the proper committees, for such expenditures as appear to be called for for the purposes of national defence. The amount is, for fortifications, \$5,000,000. For the armament of fortifications, powder, shot, &c., 1,373,748. Making an aggregate of six millions three hundred and seventy-three thousand seven hundred and forty-eight dollars. This is independent of the ordinary appropriations for arsenals, armories, &c. We subjoin a list of the fortifications accompanying the estimate, and for the construction and repair of which the money is wanted. Of the amount, \$660,000 is estimated for steam batteries.

If these sums are granted, our seacoast will soon be put in a proper state of defence. For fortifications at Pensacola Bay. For fortifications at Kennebec River. For Fort Preble, Portland Harbor. For fortifications at Portsmouth, N. Hampshire. For Fort Pickens, Salem. For Fort Independence, Castle Island, Boston Harbor. For Fort Warren, George's Island. For fortifications at Provincetown, Cape Cod. For Fort Adams. For a Fort on Rose Island. For Fort Griswold. For Fort Schuyler, Throg's Neck. For Fort Columbus, and other works on Governor's Island. For Fort Tompkins and dependencies. For Fort Dearborn. For a Fort at the debouche of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. For fortifications to cover the artificial harbor at Cape Henlopen. For a Fort on Soller's Point Flats. For Fort McHenry, Redoubt Wood, and Covington Battery. For a Fort on Point Patience, Patuxent River. For a Fort at Cedar Point, Potomac River. For Fort Monroe. For Fort Calhoun. For Fort Caswell, Oak Island. For Redoubt on Federal Point. For fortifications in Charleston Harbor. For Fort Pulaski, Cooks spur Island, Savannah River. For fortifications at the Mouth of St. Mary's River. For fortifications at St. Augustine. For Fort Pickens, Pensacola. For Fort Barrages. For Fort St. Philip. For incidental Expenses. For Contingencies of Fortifications. For Steam Batteries.

LETTER OF THE DUKE DE BROGLIE TO M. PAGOET.

Late U. S. Charge d'Affaires of France at Washington. PARIS, 17th June, 1835.

Sir.—There no longer exists on our part any obstacle to the entire accomplishment of the treaty concluded on the 4th of July, 1831, between France and the United States. The project of law relative to the indemnities reciprocally stipulated in that treaty, after having successively passed the two Chambers, has received the royal sanction.

I say on our part; for every thing now depends on the Government of the United States; it belongs to them to remove the only obstacle that still subsists. By virtue of a clause inserted in Art. 1st by the Chamber of Deputies, the French Government must defer making the payments agreed upon, until that of the United States shall have explained the true meaning and real purport of its passages inserted by the President of the Union in his Message, at the opening of the last session of Congress, and at which all France at the first aspect was justly offended.

The Government having discovered nothing in that clause a variance with its own sentiments, or the course which it had intended to pursue, the project of law, thus amended on the 18th of April by the Chamber of Deputies, was carried on the 27th to the Chamber of Peers. I herewith annex the expose which accompanied it. That document will show you, in a few words, in what light we consider the respective positions of the two countries. I also annex the report of the Committee, presented to the Chamber of Peers, on the 5th of June. You will thereby see how far that House concurred in the opinion of the Chamber of Deputies.

Mr. Livingston has left Paris, without waiting for the vote of the Chamber of Peers, leaving Mr. Barton as Charge d'Affaires. The letter by which he accredited him to the French Government, is of the 29th of April. You will find a copy of it subjoined.

In a note dated 27th, Mr. Livingston assigns as the cause of his departure, the silence observed by the French Government in relation to a previous note of the 18th, in which that Minister, agreeably to orders from his government, demanded the explanation of an expression made use of by Mr. Serurier in a note he passed to Mr. Forsyth at the time he left. That explanation, sir, we will show ourselves very willing to furnish, if it should be asked for again, when we ourselves shall have received those which we have a right to expect.

Annexed are copies of the two notes of the 18th and 27th.

On the 25th, Mr. Livingston had addressed to me a third note of great length, in which, whilst he forbears making allusion to the amendment introduced by the Chamber of Deputies, he fully enters into its principle and probable consequences, as you may ascertain by reading that paper. As long as the amendment was but a simple project, the initiative of which did not even belong to the Government, I thought proper to abstain from entering into any controversy on this subject with the Minister of a foreign Government. Now that the project has become a law by the concurrence of the two Chambers and the sanction of the King, it is my duty to justify it against objections which are utterly groundless.

I shall first recall a few facts. The project of law relative to the execution of the Treaty signed on the 4th of July 1831, had been presented three times to the Chamber of Deputies, viz. the 6th of April, 1833; the 11th of June of the same year; and the 13th of January of the year following, when it was rejected by a majority of 8 votes on the 1st of April 1834.

The news of its rejection was known at Washington on the 6th of May, through a packet which sailed from Liverpool on the 6th of April.

On the 4th of June, Mr. Serurier informed the Secretary of State, that the King's Government had determined to present anew the project of law at the next session of the Chambers. The loss of the bill having occasioned the resignation of the Minister who had signed it, and this circumstance having caused different changes in the Cabinet, the Government course now definitively adopted that determination until the 8th of April. The brig Le Cassinier, bearer of new instructions to Mr. Serurier, had moreover met with a long and stormy passage.

At the express request of Mr. McLane, then Secretary of State, Mr. Serurier communicated, the next day, in writing, the declaration which he had already made verbally. His note is dated the 5th of June.

The reply of Mr. McLane is of the 27th. In this reply, Mr. McLane states in express terms in the name of his Government, that the President of the United States will rely on the assurances Mr. Serurier has been instructed to give him, and will wait hereafter with confidence for the appeal that is to be made to the new Chamber.

Mr. Serurier, in his note of the 5th of June, had incidentally observed that it was the intention of the French Government to present again the rejected law as early as a period as our Constitution would permit. That intention was real; our desire was sincere; but it naturally followed from the very nature and terms of the engagement, that it referred to no particular fixed period, and was left dependent either upon the different exigencies of our internal situation, or upon the object which both Governments were equally anxious to obtain.

In the month of August, the Chambers were assembled, but merely for form, and for the sole purpose of complying with the provisions of the 42d article of the Charter. No project of law was either presented or discussed.

Mr. Livingston at Paris, and the President of the United States at Washington, having seemed to regret that the opportunity of this accidental meeting had not been embraced to place again before the Chambers the project of law relative to the Treaty of the 4th of July, it was easy to make them understand, that in acting with that precipitancy, we would not only have departed from all established usages, but compromised, instead of securing the passage of the law.

The same considerations were very naturally opposed to the request made at the subsequent period by Mr. Livingston, for a special session in the Fall. That Minister must not doubt have urged them with his Government, since the latter showed itself entirely convinced of their utility and justice.

The new Secretary of State, Mr. Forsyth, in the month of October to Mr. Serurier, The President readily understands why this business has not been taken up at the opening of the Session in August; he can now account for the fact that this demand made by Mr. Livingston of a Special Session in the Fall was declined. Mr. Forsyth, it is true, added, that the President could not understand why the project of law had not been presented to the Chambers at the end of December, instead of the beginning of that month. But that observation falls before the fact, that, by a concurrence of particular circumstances on which it would be useless to dwell, this meeting of the Chambers did in reality take place on the 1st of December.

Nothing consequently could prepare the French Government for the language of the Message sent by the President to Congress. We were aware that that Message would contain a statement of the transactions connected with the treaty of the 4th of July. Mr. Forsyth had on the 19th of November given notice of it to Mr. Serurier. But Mr. Forsyth had at the same time informed that Minister, that the President would supply advice Congress to wait for the decision of the Chambers.

What must the have been our astonishment then the Message reached his side of the Atlantic? All could be expected that the French Government, after having recalled the doubt duty of satisfying its own dignity by recalling its Minister from Washington, and of indemnifying the faith of treaties by obtaining from the Chambers the appropriation necessary to the completion of the Convention of the 4th of July; after having tendered to the Minister of the United States his passport; could it be expected, I repeat, that the French Government would not wait, before it resumed any communication on the subject with the Government of the Union; and before it renewed with it the interrupted relations, that the latter would come forward and express itself in terms calculated to dispel the unfortunate relations to which the Message had given rise.

Such is in fact, and in substance the core which the amendment introduced by the Chamber of Deputies has pointed out to the Government; such is the course which the Government intended to have pursued, even if the law had not made it their duty.

Nevertheless it is against this course so simple, so

reasonable, that Mr. Livingston seems to wish to protest beforehand.

Mr. Livingston fully admits in his note of the 27th of April, the right of foreign Governments to take proper exception to the acts and language of the Government which he represents.

"Should the President," he observes, "DO AN OFFICIAL EXECUTIVE ACT AFFECTING A FOREIGN POWER, or use exceptional language in addressing it, through his Minister, or through those who should be passed injurious to the dignity of another nation; in all these, and other similar cases, a demand for explanation would be respectfully received, and answered in the manner that justice, and a regard to the dignity of the complaining nation, would require."

But he maintains that these principles, the wisdom of which is evident, are not applicable to an act by which the President, sole representative of the nation towards foreign powers, gives to Congress an account of the situation of foreign relations.

"The utmost freedom," says Mr. Livingston,—"the utmost freedom from all restraint in the details into which he is obliged to enter, of international concerns, and of the measures in relation to them, is essential to the proper performance of this important part of his functions. He must exercise them without having continually before him the fear of offending the susceptibility of the powers whose conduct he is obliged to notice."

"Were any foreign powers," continues Mr. Livingston, "permitted to scan the communications of the Executive, their complaints, whether real or affected, would involve the country in continual controversies; for the right being admitted, it would be a duty to exercise it, by demanding a disavowal of every phrase they might deem offensive, and an explanation of every word to which an improper interpretation could be given. The principle, therefore, has been adopted, that no foreign power has a right to ask for explanations of anything that the President, in the exercise of his functions, thinks proper to communicate to Congress, or of any course he may advise them to pursue."

We cannot, sir, admit such a principle; we cannot admit it at least without condition or limit, in an absolute, general, and peremptory sense.

It does not depend upon a nation from the mere fact of its having adopted such or such a form of Government, to acquire with regard to foreign powers, more rights than it would have had, or to arrogate to itself other rights than those which it would have enjoyed under any other form of government.

Nations are free to choose, without any constraint, the government they please—precisely for this reason, and under this condition, that such a choice concerns them exclusively, and that whatever that choice may be, it cannot affect the rights or injure the legitimate interests of other nations.

Now it is the acknowledged right of every Government, when the legal representative, or when the official organ of another Government, expresses himself publicly in reference to it, in language which is deemed offensive, to demand an explanation of it. Such a right the Constitution of the United States can neither abolish, modify or restrict. It is an international right (un droit international).—It suits the people of the United States to give the power of the Union between a President and a Congress. Be it so. It suits them to oblige the President to give publicly to Congress an account of the state of foreign relations. Their right is unquestionable. But that the President of the United States, the official organ, the legal representative of the Union towards foreign nations, thereby acquires the right to express himself publicly upon foreign Governments in language offensive to those Governments; that he should, in asserting the liberty, the freedom reserved for such communications, dispense with all reserve in his language, and with all responsibility towards the powers whom that language concerns, is what we cannot admit.

Irresponsibility (l'irresponsabilite) whether it relates to persons, to acts, or to words, irresponsibility, when it is legally established, is a pure national institution, a purely internal regulation, and can never be used as an argument in the intercourse which Governments hold with each other. If it were otherwise, and if we were to suppose, as Mr. Livingston does, that the President is the agent to its extreme consequences, in a word, if we maintained that the President of the United States has the right, provided it be in a Message to Congress, to impute publicly to foreign Governments and to foreign nations the most odious acts, the most perverse intentions; to hold them up publicly to the animadversion of the world, without these governments or these nations having the right to manifest the slightest resentment, since, according to this very strange doctrine, they would not even be allowed to take official notice of it.

To state such a doctrine, is to refute it. However, sir, we do not wish to exaggerate anything. Mr. Livingston is perfectly right when he says that the cause, in a general sense, common to all free countries.—That all Governments founded on the division of powers, and on the publicity of debates, have an interest in repelling, on the part of foreign powers, any interference with the communications which the Prince and his Ministers in constitutional Monarchies, and in republics the Magistrates entrusted with executive power, are called upon to make to the Legislature. And this is the reason, Mr. Livingston very judiciously observes, that in France and in England, the language of the royal speeches is so reserved in every thing that concerns Foreign relations; and it is this same motive, as you will observe, Sir, to the cabinet of Washington, that has directed the conduct of France in relation to the Message of President Jackson.—If the expressions contained in that Message had been inserted in a proclamation, or any other act of the executive power of the Union, we would at once have called for an explanation. Out of respect for the very nature of the act, the French Government deemed it expedient to manifest the sentiments it felt on that occasion, by instantly recalling its Minister, and stating in a communication the motives for that recall; but it did not ask for explanations; it was contented to expect them from the justice of the Government of the United States, and from the ancient friendship of the American nation, not doubting that the Government of the United States would appreciate the difference in such cases, between answering an interpellation, and preventing by a spontaneous determination, by explanations readily offered, a mission and dispute always to be regretted.

The amendment of the Chamber of Deputies is conceived in the same spirit of reserve and conciliation. It does not make it the duty of the French Government to ask for explanations; it merely supposes they will receive them. We were not mistaken, Sir, in believing that the Government of the United States would appreciate the difference, since Mr. Livingston, as he himself observes, hastened as early as the 29th of January last, when the Message of President Jackson had been only known a few days, to offer us explanations at great length, of every passage of that Message which threatened the relations between the United States and France; and since, that step January have received, as he informs us by his note of the 25th of April, the entire approbation of the President.

Mr. Livingston was not astonished that those explanations, as long as they were presented only upon his personal responsibility, did not produce upon us the effect he intended; but he supposes that being now clothed with the approbation of the President, they must satisfy all that the nicest sense of national honor could desire.

He therefore makes it a point in his note of the 25th, to repeat and to develop them, in the hope that the French government by examining them anew, under the impression that they had become the expression of the sentiments of the President, would deem them sufficient. It is so much the more anxious to impart to us his own conviction on this subject, as he deems it impossible for the Government of the United States to go any further. He even seems to be apprehensive that future events which he does not specify, designating thereby, no doubt, the adoption of the amendment of the Chamber of Deputies by the other two branches of the Government, may hereafter render improper any allusion to explanations presented under the influence of different circumstances.

We sincerely wish, sir, not to add to the difficulties of the situation in which the two countries are respectively placed. The question of date, to which Mr. Livingston seems, in this case, to attach an importance which belongs not to us to appreciate, does not in any way alter either the nature or the extent of the duties which are prescribed to us. Satisfaction had really been given to the just susceptibility of the French Nation as early as the 29th of January, (the date of Mr. Livingston's first note,) and therefore previous to the adoption of the amendment under consideration by the Chamber of Deputies, or as early as the 27th of April, the date of Mr. Livingston's 2d

note, that is to say, before the adoption of this same amendment by the other two branches of the Legislature, we would have sincerely gratified. The more the government of the United States would have shown a willingness to explain itself, the more we should be disposed to find that explanation satisfactory, and to view the solicitude of that government as a testimony in favor of the intentions which had dictated the Message of the President.

We will simply observe before we proceed:—First, That even supposing the explanations, given by the note of the 29th of January, to have been such as we might have wished them, they were on the 18th of April, the day of the passage of the amendment in the Chamber of Deputies, nothing more than the simple expression of the personal sentiments of Mr. Livingston. This is an observation which did not escape his notice.

We will also observe that by the publication of Mr. Livingston's correspondence, the Government of the U. S. had excited against him such a feeling of irritation that it would have been out of our power, even supposing that we had considered that correspondence as containing nothing but what was right and proper, to avail ourselves of a document bearing his signature, to repel in one or the other of the Chambers the amendment under consideration.

I will not proceed to the examination of the explanations which have been offered to us.

Mr. Livingston is right in thinking that our objections to the Message of the President are confined to these two points.

1st. The Message impeaches the good faith of His Majesty's Government.

2d. It contains a threat to secure the execution of the treaty by the fear of reprisals.

It is indeed under this double point of view that the Message of President Jackson exhibited in France the greatest indignation. The Cabinet of Washington will readily admit that if the allegations contained in the Message were to be taken as true, no Government, no people, would for one moment bear (1) itself either to the direct or indirect imputation of a want of good faith, to the idea of another Government or another people endeavoring to obtain from it through menace, what would only be granted by its justice. It must equally be admitted that when the impression produced by the appearance of any document is general; when that impression is felt, not only by the whole nation whom the document concerns, but even by foreigners, by uninterested people, by persons the least disposed to take a part in the contest, the very universality of that impression is a sufficient evidence against the general tenor of the document.

If we examine in detail the Message of the President of the United States, (I mean that part of it which relates to the relations between the U. States and France,) it will possibly be found that passing successively from general imputations to the Cabinet of Washington will readily admit that if the allegations contained in the Message were to be taken as true, no Government, no people, would for one moment bear (1) itself either to the direct or indirect imputation of a want of good faith, to the idea of another Government or another people endeavoring to obtain from it through menace, what would only be granted by its justice. It must equally be admitted that when the impression produced by the appearance of any document is general; when that impression is felt, not only by the whole nation whom the document concerns, but even by foreigners, by uninterested people, by persons the least disposed to take a part in the contest, the very universality of that impression is a sufficient evidence against the general tenor of the document.

If we examine in detail the Message of the President of the United States, (I mean that part of it which relates to the relations between the U. States and France,) it will possibly be found that passing successively from general imputations to the Cabinet of Washington will readily admit that if the allegations contained in the Message were to be taken as true, no Government, no people, would for one moment bear (1) itself either to the direct or indirect imputation of a want of good faith, to the idea of another Government or another people endeavoring to obtain from it through menace, what would only be granted by its justice. It must equally be admitted that when the impression produced by the appearance of any document is general; when that impression is felt, not only by the whole nation whom the document concerns, but even by foreigners, by uninterested people, by persons the least disposed to take a part in the contest, the very universality of that impression is a sufficient evidence against the general tenor of the document.

It is not so, however; at least we hope it is not. But to banish entirely such an idea, what would be necessary? Nothing but what is very simple. We do not here content ourselves with that phrase, this or that allegation, this or that expression; we content ourselves with the intention itself, which has dictated that part of the Message. If it be true that the President of the United States, in presenting to Congress a statement of the facts connected with the Treaty of the 4th of July, had no intention to cast any doubt on the good faith of the French government; if it be true that the President of the United States proposing to Congress to decree the seizure by force of the French property, had not the intention to cast any doubt upon the good faith of the French government, we can see how he could find any difficulty in making such a declaration really contained in Mr. Livingston's note, addressed to the French Government on the 29th of January, or in that which the same Minister left at his departure on the 27th of April?

We would be equally at a loss to affirm or to deny it;—and for this reason it is evident that neither the one nor the other can be considered sufficient. The note of the 29th of January is intended to discuss, contradictorily with the French government, the contents of the Message inserted in the Message of President Jackson. It is intended to prove that the view taken by him of these facts is at least plausible. It is in the midst of this long disquisition that two or three phrases are incidentally thrown out, on the just confidence which the government of the U. States has always entertained in the sincerity of the French government; confidence which Mr. Livingston had always made it a duty to foster, and which, according to the usual course of things, would have been the subject of a not in contradiction with any of the ideas or allegations expressed in the Message. The note of the 25th of April, is chiefly intended to make an indirect and anticipated examination of the amendment introduced by the Chamber of Deputies. While upon this examination, and with a view to prove that any demand for explanations would in future be useless in fact, and inadmissible in principle, Mr. Livingston refers to the testimony given by him in his first note, to the good faith of the French government; he refers to subsequent sanction given by the President to the contents of that note; he dwells on the paragraph of the Message of the President, in which all idea of threat, in his words, expressly disavowed.

You will easily conceive, Sir, and the Cabinet of Washington will, we think, understand it also, that such phrases incidentally inserted in documents, the purport and tenor of which are polemical, and surrounded in some measure, by details of a controversy which is besides not always free from bitterness, cannot dispel sufficiently the impression produced by the perusal of the Message, nor strike the mind as would the same ideas expressed in terms simple, positive, direct, and unaccompanied by any recriminations concerning facts or incidents no longer of any importance. Such is the motive, which, among many others, has placed the French Government in the impossibility of accepting the wish expressed by Mr. Livingston towards the conclusion of his note of the 25th of April, by declaring (to the Chamber of Peers probably) that previous explanations given by the Minister of the U. States, and subsequently approved by the President had satisfied it.

The impression produced by the perusal of the Message was deep. It was so in France, in Europe, and even in the United States; the debates in Congress, and public notoriety sufficiently prove the fact. Under the weight of this impression, the French Government did not hesitate to place itself in a situation to meet the engagement contracted in the name of France. In pausing there for the present, and waiting for the fulfilment of those engagements to be claimed, or expecting them to be claimed, in terms consistent with the regard which is due, it is not afraid of being considered, not France, which it represents, of being accused, of depreciating national honor by any number of millions which it could withhold, as a compensation for an injury offered to it. Mr. Livingston is the first to repel such an idea. Far from it, the French Government will consider as a fortunate day, the one in which it will be able to deliver up honorably the trust that lies in its hands; but each State has duties to perform towards itself, each situation has its exigencies. Mr. Livingston objects to the idea of seeing the President of the United States give a new testimony to the good faith of the French Government, such a step, reasonable and just in itself should not appear to be exclusively dictated by justice and by reason. He will not be astonished if the French Government, on his side, attaches an equal importance to show that an acknowledging openly a legitimate debt, and declaring itself ready to discharge it, it has exclusively consulted reason and justice.

You are authorized, sir, to read the present despatch to Mr. Forsyth, and if he desires, let him make a copy of it.

Accept, Sir, &c. &c. &c. V. BROGLIE.

(Signed)