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Sme:T have despatchid that part of Gour tever January 27 , Whath related

 gion which petand to the subject, I fin
ital but iopessibe to keep duwn the lat Buife of pust indignatien. Wholly strip off, yon are guilty of the im proplety Sfites wing a direct breach of The guestion is not now whether this a
triciur flarge is or is not botne nut.
 the prast putitical chauping, you hav Alier an elaborate and suitable enume have conmiumicated to the American $G$ verument he act of parha
1825 , vue proceed as follows previons of the act to fiud their way geneal knowfcfge thruugh the usual chan
Lel of coin mercial infurmation. Heflent oudersigned has uo season thi apcavin, ", "t the present than on formero
The list of these sentence He plaraseglggs, gives, ihe lie direct to
sipial stifenent, which, in his letter
nee Bec. $28,1826, \mathrm{Mr}$ Gatlatin infermied y
he was ingructed by his Governinent That statement was, that the America
Government did not understamd the act Parliamentef Juty, 1825, as intended
take the Colonial questimi between Gre Briaitiant the U. Slates uut of the exis lig negatiatio latin enumerate sons woykhe anmerican
 re gond or bad. Thesy, werce ihe reason
idduced by Mr. Galatin, by order (as
tod yout of his G for this one fec, Gize: that the the a Amerouica
Covernment did not understand the act Pofliament of July, 1825 ; as intended
frect गo the negotiation un the Colonial Anorvsirg you say, in effect, that the
it. After Goovermingen, did so understan
indry itgeniegs teaso why hieact was not communicated and go en and sa
intiecimen

## bare no reasar to anperpliend tourre has proved lese effectual

senct than on Hy
Hive on reasinn
meriman Goversbient stids not understa

 effict, , the face of this statement, and in the
In fice of the groinds by which the Amer
can Minister suippoted it, you tell hin
hat you hive no reason to apprehend tha
The act of July, i825, was that yof hive ne reason to apprchend tha
he act of July, 882 , was not understoo
by the American Goverument, in its in
iendel application.
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pass on, to examine
Yhiver statement
gave. his reasons
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yernent dha no
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 ieftaniming the 0ifent of the act of Par
limment, that the conditions of it were no limment, that thee Unditions of in were not
aceepted by the United States;
 minute elrcay informafion, with regard th
foreigh country. I perceive hat you complimented in the London papers on the nrecision and comprehensiveness of you
knowledge of the details of this very ques.
 see if I aty safe in
curnals of Congress.
 Whiut six weeks after the conmencerient
of the. irst session of the Nineteenct Con-
gress. It was not, as ynu say, a resolu

## criminating duties, Instead of being intended (as you say) to urge the Exxecutive Government of the O. $S$. to coine into the terng of

 C. S. to coine into the terms of yur act.Mr: Cambreleng, who movedt the resolution,
said, "he hed reason to believe the measure would be acceptabte to our own ro-
vernment," and that, "without some mo-
dification of the law of 1823 . the Executive could not remove the discriminating
daty! Now, Sir, what think ynu of the accu-
racy of your information? This resolution, which you say was de-
bated andi finally rejected by a majority
of two votes, I say was not opposed by any one ; and after a single renark froni the
Chairman of the Cummittee of Commerce, (Mr. Newton) and from Mr. Cambreleng,
wac passed. nemine contradicente! So say.
at least the Jumrnal of the House of Repre.
sentatives, and so says the National Intelsentatives, and so says the National Intel-
ligencer f fro Jan. 26, 1826 .
What think you again of the accuracy What think you again of the accuracy
of ynur deails? The debate to which
you allude as having token place on a res-
olution in the House of Representatives.
took place on a bill in the Senate, of which took place on a bill in the Senate, of which
the object. in like manner, was not to urge
the Exece:tive, as you, I-think, with great the Exec.ive, as yout thater, the law.
indelicacy allege, but to
Suppuse, Sir, that Mr. Clay, in his cor-
respondence with Mr. Vaughan, a fecting a great display of minute information, should
speak of a bill in the Honse of Lords to a
mend a law, as a resolution in the House
oteconimons to urge the King, what should ot Commons to urge the King, what shou
you think of the accuracy of his state
ments? What should you think of h
sense of decorum, in undertaking to arr
 have thought the error extremely discred-
itable-the intention extrenely imperti-
nent.
Take the case of the late debate on the Catholic question, in the House of Com
mons-chat d bate, in the course of which
as I understand it, you say, "" your hon as I understand it, you say, "your honor
and honesty had been impeached," by the
Maston of the Rolls. (one of the highest ju-
dicial efficers of the reilm.) That debate, licial efficers of the reallo.) That debate,
l believe, was on a resulution of Sir Fran-
cis Burdett, looking to a modification of
the lave in recard to the Cathulics. Sup. pose Mr. Clay should, next year, in writ.
ping an official note to the British Minister at Waslington, transfor the scene of that
debate to the House of Lords, and convert
the proposition from a measure of Legislative tendency into a a mesolution to urge the
King to take some step of Executive dis-
cretion. Would not such a misstatement have filled you with distain?
Ysur own is precisely of the same quali-
ty, with ihis ty, with his-difference agoinst you, that in-
stead of being ias the Catholic question is
to us) an indifferent natter, on which we are not concerned ta be mientely inform-
ed, your misstatement refers to the sub-
ject matter of a very important negotiation, a matter whose progress through Con-
gress you expressly undertake to describe.
In my next-leter I shall take you into
ihe Senate of the U. S. and when I have
subaitted to you the contrast of what realIy there tork putace, with your account of
it. I shonld not be suiprised if you came to ine risolution that yourprised if you came to to
should be not merely "the last word" in
sh this discussion, but jour last word, fore
ver on this subjject.
Be pleaased. ieanime, to accept, \&c.
AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Prom the Bailimimere Republican. } \\
& \text { ON CONVENION OF MARYLAND, }
\end{aligned}
$$

Held at Baltimore, 21st Muy, 1827 .
The Delegates having assemblad at the
Whas called to order by Roger B Ta-
M. Forman, of Cecil county, Thomas M. Forman, of Cecil county, wis chusen
to preside. Whilian M. Beall, of Frede-
rick county, was then appointed Secretary, and John B. Brooke, of Priace George's
county. Assistant Secretary.
The list of Delegates to the Convention Was then caflided over in number 84 .
The attendance of the ry full, most of the above gentlemen an Mr. Winchester, of, Baltimore, after
making a few remarks, subuitted the follouking Preamble and Resolutions : The fundamental principle upon which our
whele eystem erests, is the pointical equality of te
itizens-and from this pelitical equalty neces
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