wish to extenuate, but I have no hesitation to disavow it. It is to the letter it has also the small fault of being obscure.

The next letter is course is that of Mr Smith of the 19 of October, in which Mr. Jackson is reminded that the President expected "a formal and satisfactory explanation" of the transaction of the Discovered, and he is told that the President "perceives in that explanation ground to be satisfied that there has been given an explanation which is adequate either as to the matter or its mode." In a subsequent part of the letter the Secretary goes on to say—"The stress you have laid upon what you have been pleased to state as the substitution of the terms Finality and Sovereignty for the terms proposed has excited no small degree of surprise." And they did it excite no much surprise in Mr. Smith? Why is it that he now, for the first time, had information of the offensive conditions, or that the alleged substitution was considered by him as an imputation on his honour or that the Government had not thus given the answer.

"Certain it is that your predecessor in his letter of the 24th of October, three conditions which now appear in the Discovered document; that he was disposed to agree to more than one of the terms of one of them (both palpably bad in shape, and some more than merely inadmissible) could perhaps, rest on finding his first proposals unsuccessful, the more reasonable terms contained in the subsequent proposals appear to the undersigned were a deposal." Why, sir, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs shown by Mr. Erskine, business were presented by him, and you yourself acknowledge he has certain, and other terms finally adopted. And whether you call the proposal a substitution or by some other name, it was one natural course to be taken.

Mr. Smith then proceeds to say—"And what, sir, is there in this to impugn the conduct of those who have chosen in favor of the right of his Britannic Majesty to discussion upon a subject of a strictly domestic nature in public negotiations than to hesitate with a slight demand, and, and fully, to disclaim the power? Why, sir, if upon the mode of instruction, two or more than two grades of propositions to the same of instructions have been with what is the most desirable and to and which is the least inadmissible in case the more desirable should not be attainable. This is a course which is every day occurring, and it is confirmed by universal experience."

Which were the real and entire intentions of your predecessor, he is equivocal generally between him and his government. This is a fault, sir, which, that he believed he had sufficient authority to conclude the arrangement, forwarded, and approved during our discussions, were such as to leave no room for doubt. *His second part of the 11th* Mr. Erskine, being his assurance to me "that the terms of the agreement so happily concluded by the recent negotiation will be strictly fulfilled on the part of His Majesty?" is an evident indication of what he persuaded then was as to his instructions. And with a view to view what his impressions have been since the discovered, I must take the liberty of referring you to the answer of Canning (See C.) from the official letters of the 31st July & of the 14th August.

"The declaration "that the despatch from Mr. Canning to Mr. Erskine of the 31st January is in the language by which the conditions were prescribed to Mr. Erskine for the conclusion of arrangements on the terms which it relates" is now for the first time made to this government, and I feel sandy sir, that the despatch had been communicated at the time of the arrangement, or if it been known that the proposition contained in it and which were at first presented by Mr. Erskine, were the one and one which he was authorized to make an arrangement, the arrangement would perhaps have been made.

I must say, sir, here to recollect that when Mr. Smith wrote this letter he knew the instructions of the 31st of January which, tho' they may be, deemed offensive, are precise and, and, and that Mr. Erskine had not only seriously pledged himself that Mr. Erskine had no other instructions, but had placed the right of disapproval on this very circumstance, in which I have ventured to call it receive a direct charge of falsehood of Mr. Smith to Mr. Jackson.

"Which Secretary not only intimated that Mr. Erskine had several instructions or different grades

Blows in the same instructions alternate to make on the

Mr. Erskine's assurance of the contrary. In doing this he indicates that the British

has been guilty of security

company in refusing to fect the arrangement, and should on the first of the

of that government. For you will recollect that by the letter of Mr. Pinkney of the 28th of May