

of affection, shall call forth the energies which it has pleased heaven to bestow on me.

But in the present instance, the course pursued by the executive is manifestly founded in wisdom, moderation, and firmness, and merits the undivided support of the American people. Can I then, sir, forbear to express my astonishment, that the minister of Great Britain should find an advocate within these sacred walls? It is not wonderful that in matters of internal policy, we should differ as to the means best calculated to promote the general good; these differences often lead to useful investigation, and produce the most salutary results. But I cannot reconcile my mind to the novel and afflicting controversy which has arisen out of the subject under consideration.

Before I proceed to discuss the points immediately embraced by the resolution on your table, permit me to notice the remarks which have been made by gentlemen opposed to the measure, in relation to the character of Mr. Jackson. On this subject there appears to exist an uncommon portion of sensibility. The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Quincy) has told us that we are about to fulminate legislative contumely against the accredited minister of the sovereign of a great and powerful nation, who is bound to see that whatever treatment he may receive is not disrespectful. And the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Gardenier) has added, that the adoption of this resolution will inflict a fatal wound on the character of Mr. Jackson. Sir, I beg gentlemen who feel thus tenderly for the reputation of this minister, to tell us in what country he has acquired this celebrity of character? By what noble deeds has he signalized himself, and where is the record of them to be found? Was it prior to his memorable mission to Copenhagen, or subsequent to that disgraceful event, that he was clothed with the mantle of fame of which we are about to disrobe him? If gentlemen refer to a period anterior to the destruction of that devoted city, I put it to their candour to say, whether that act of perfidy, at the recollection of which the human mind recoils with horror and detestation, is not enough to stamp with infamy, the vile instrument of treachery and assassination who performed it? Can gentlemen be really in earnest when they speak with reverence of the character of Mr. Jackson? I hope they will pardon my doubts as to the sincerity of their declarations. What, sir, was the conduct of Mr. King, our late envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in London, when it was proposed to send this same Mr. Jackson to the United States as the minister of Great Britain on a former occasion? And let it be remembered that Mr. King is a federalist; a distinguished member of that party, who now manifest so much zeal in vindicating the character of Mr. Jackson. If I am correctly informed, and if not I call upon gentlemen to deny the fact; Mr. King felt it his incumbent duty to remonstrate against the appointment of Mr. Jackson as the resident minister in the United States. Was this a

wanton act  
any gentle  
actuated by  
to say that  
To what cau  
The turbule  
suggest its  
The British  
dinary dupl  
incendiary:  
tremble lest  
sacrifice to t

[Mr. Gar  
as attemptin  
Mr. G. I exp  
my argumen  
from imputin  
of Mr. Jacks  
considered h  
ther it is dem  
does not dese  
tion which ca

Mr. P. sa  
had stated h  
had understo  
thus anxious  
from the dest  
terious effect  
the character  
eulogy cannot  
lummy and de  
dulgence of t  
were in opera  
gress. Com  
Great Britain  
dicted. Prov  
six thousand  
the United St  
including a la  
holding in req  
march at a m  
the crisis dem  
red to produc  
hostility? Ab  
dinary session  
the President