

THE WEEKLY OBSERVER.

GRAND-BRITAIN. LONDON.

Reported Changes in the Ministry.—On the 23d of May, London was full of reports of a change in the Administration; and stating that Lord Palmerston and Mr. Huskisson had both resigned; another confining the resignation to the latter minister only. Both of these persons are said to have been absent from the Lords Mayor's dinner. It is believed that Mr. Peel has taken office at the votes given by Mr. Huskisson and Lord Palmerston upon the East Retford Disfranchisement Bill and especially against Mr. Huskisson, whom the advocates of Mr. Peel accuse of having spoken on one side and voted on the other. It is added that the Right Honourable Gentleman will be succeeded in his office of Secretary of the Colonies by Mr. Goulburn, and that Mr. Herries will be the new Chancellor of the Exchequer. This rumour has obtained considerable credit; but nothing official has transpired on the subject.—Some of the Cabinet Ministers were opposed to each other in the Division. The question whether the franchise should be removed to a Great City, or to a Hundred in the County of Nottingham might seem, prima facie, not of issue to be of such vast importance. But the issue of the debate and the division have given rise to strong rumours of a resignation or resignations. The Courier says: "Deeply, indeed, should we lament their confirmation; because we trusted the greatest cordiality existed, and because the country would thereby be deprived of the services of men of talent, at a time when such services were so necessary." The Ledger says, the East Retford affair "is thought by many not to be the real cause for the rumour of the retirement of Mr. Huskisson and the Secretary at War; but that other and stronger differences connected with more important questions, are the reasons which will lead to the resignations mentioned, should they take place. We trust, however, that the rumours to which we have alluded, will prove but rumours. At no period of our history within the last 20 years, did our domestic politics, or the state of our foreign relations, require more the existence of a strong and well-cemented Administration to meet them, than at the present moment. Very much indeed shall we regret to find, that at a time when unanimity is so necessary, there should be found differences of opinion among the Confidential Servants of the Crown, of sufficient weight and influence to deprive his Majesty and the country of the councils and assistance, which the individuals in question are qualified to afford him at this important crisis."

The Morning Herald of the 23d, speaks in the following tone of confidence upon the subject:—"There appears to be no doubt but that there has been a schism in the Administration, and that two of the Ministers, viz. Mr. Huskisson and Lord Palmerston, are out of office."

"The indisposition mentioned in the apology sent by Mr. Huskisson to the Lord Mayor, on Wednesday, for his non-attendance at the civic dinner, was doubtless political, for Mr. H. I believe, was in perfect health, and walking in St. James's Park at the time the other Ministers were starting for the Mansion House."

"Lord Goderich, it is understood, succeeds Mr. Huskisson; and Lord Farborough Lord Palmerston. Lord F. it is even said, received his appointment on Wednesday from the King, at an interview which his Lordship had of His Majesty."

"The unexpected resignation of Mr. Huskisson and Lord Palmerston, caused an extraordinary meeting of Ministers at midnight, on Wednesday night, at Mr. Peel's private residence in Privy Gardens, where the Duke of Wellington, Lords Aberdeen and Bathurst, Messrs. Peel and Goulburn, assembled, after leaving the Mansion house, and did not separate till between two and three o'clock in the morning."

"Mr. Huskisson, has, we believe, sacrificed already too much for the sake of holding his present situation in the Cabinet. That he was sincerely desirous of being in a situation to benefit his country, we firmly believe. We will say further, that we conceive his resignation at this time will be seriously felt by the nation; for, if we are not misinformed, he has matured a plan for relieving the country from the burden caused by the Colonies, by making them bear their own charges; a change not merely important as it regards ourselves, but as it regards the Colonies, which are injured by the very expense of which we complain, that expense being incurred in upholding a system of government hostile to the interests of the Colonies, and which can only be continued by coercion.—Lon. Chron."

"The right-seeing people never had so wide a field as London offers them in this season. It has been calculated that it would employ a fortnight, fully occupied from eight o'clock in the morning to six at night, only to take a glimpse at all that may be seen."

"The sum advanced last year to the Government by the Bank of England was £2,000,000, but ten millions of the twenty-one was on account of Dead Weight."

"The average amount of the public money in the hands of the Bank of England last year was £4,000,000."

"The sum charged last year by the Bank of England, for the management of the Debt was £280,000."

"The total sum paid last year in the city of London for the measuring of coals was £4,800."

"The sum that was in the Treasury on the 31st of January last amounted to £350,000."

"The East India Company intend following up the thanks which they have voted to Earl Amherst and Lord Combermere for their services in India, as they have already done to Major-General Sir A. Campbell, and that to the late Governor-General a pension of £3,000 a year for life is to be granted; and to the Commander-in-Chief, a residence in London (to be called Blueport House) is to be presented."

"From the Morning Herald of May 22."

"We received last night the Paris papers by express. Their contents, though they supply nothing new or decisive, are yet interesting. Accounts from Bucharest of the 20th ultimo, give us a stupendous idea of the forces which are to be employed by Russia in her present conflict with the Turks. In point of numbers they greatly exceed any former effort of that power; and we know that with respect to discipline and organization, there is no comparison between the present and the past. The war against France may be truly said to have advanced the Russians a whole century in the military art; and in all times brave, they now combine the highest skill and experience with their characteristic courage. In fact, they have all the martial properties of a rude and civilized age.—i. e., they can endure fatigue, privations, and hardships, as well as the most barbarous warriors—and at the same time rival the best troops in the qualities by which these are distinguished from the former. The numerous strength of the armies which were assembled at the beginning of this month on the frontiers of Turkey is estimated in

this article at 200,000 men; and, when it is considered that these are picked troops—in fact, the elite of the military force of that colossal empire—a tolerable notion may be formed of the extent of her means and her chances of success. The latter are so decidedly in her favour, that only a combination of the most extraordinary circumstances can defeat the accomplishment of those designs upon the whole line of the Danube, which the leaders from every that capital. It is also true, that the plan of the Russians to make a dash upon that place, and by the celerity of their movements, aided by the vast superiority of their numerical force, to carry that important point before the Russian forces could be brought to the scene, is not greatly mistaken, as they are called, are the blind and unfeeling instruments of the most formidable and aspiring power, not excepting France, that has appeared since the decline of the Roman Empire."

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—Sir Robert Wilson, in the House of Commons on the 19th, after dilating on the warlike preparations making by certain powers with regard to the pacification of Greece, inquired whether the British Government, notwithstanding all that had taken place, still thought itself bound to adhere to the treaty of the 6th of July; whether we combined with France in the Treaty of the 6th of July; whether we combined with France in the operations deemed necessary for the fulfilment of that Treaty, to which Russia might still be considered a party; and whether the naval commander in the Mediterranean had accounted for not strictly enforcing the blockade of the different fortified ports in the Morea."

Mr. Secretary Peel avowed his readiness to vindicate the policy of His Majesty's Government, but said that considerations of prudence prevented his giving that explicit information which the Hon. Member desired. With respect to the treaty of July 6, from the time of signing it to the present moment, government was most anxious punctually and scrupulously to fulfil all its engagements, and this desire was not altered in the least in consequence of the recent change in the position of Russia. That change would involve most important considerations as to the manner of executing the treaty; but what these considerations were he could not consistently with his sense of public duty, state. Explanations from the naval commander in the Mediterranean had been received, but the Honorable Secretary said he must be excused from stating what was their nature or their result."

In the House of Commons, on the 16th May, Sir F. Burdett moved the order of the day for taking into consideration the report of the committee upon the Roman Catholic claims. He afterwards moved that the resolution agreed to by the House, be communicated to the House of Lords in a conference, and their consent desired. Mr. Secretary Peel concurred with Sir Francis in the course he proposed. A resolution to the above effect was then offered by Sir Francis Burdett, which was agreed to."

The conference took place on the 19th between committees of both Houses of Parliament on the Catholic question, on which occasion Sir Francis Burdett, as manager on the part of the Committee, offered the following resolution:—"That it is expedient to consider the laws affecting His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great-Britain and Ireland, with a view to such final and conciliatory adjustments as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of His Majesty's subjects."

On motion of the Marquis of Lansdowne, it was agreed that the resolution should be taken into consideration on the 9th of June, and their Lordships were summoned for that day."

On the 16th May, the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved that the House resolve into a Committee of Supply, for the purpose of voting the Navy Estimates, &c. &c. and stated as a justification for the proceeding, previously to the presentation of any report from the "Finance Committee," that such Committee, owing to the multifarious character of their inquiries, saw the impossibility of making any report this Session in time for the due consideration of the Estimates. They were, therefore, brought forward. Mr. Calcraft and others observed on the tardy movements of the Committee, who had sent three months without making, or being prepared to present, any report to the House."

Sir H. Parnell (the Chairman) defended the Committee, and declared that they had been by no means deficient in diligence, for they had sat forty-seven days, examined thirty-three witnesses, ordered and had presented to them three hundred and thirty-seven accounts, and had already got in print upwards of two thousand folio pages of evidence. The Committee, he further stated, had determined not to present any Report till they could make an adequate one. Sir J. Newport said there had seldom been fewer than twenty members present, and that they had assembled daily from twelve till four o'clock. Mr. Calcraft remarked that, as the Committee had hitherto done nothing, what was to be expected from them this session? Mr. Hume said that results had justified what he had urged when the Committee was named—the appointment of distinct Committees for each branch of service. They had as yet only in-

vestigated three out of the numerous heads of public service; that official men only had been examined; that they all supported the existing establishments; and that all the documentary and other evidence was of the like tendency; so that to say the country were to expect any thing from this Committee, especially in the way of reductions, would only be to hold forth a delusion. The country, he declared, must be "disappointed" by the results of the Committee's labors. Such, then, is the fate of the renowned Finance Committee! Whether the country will be "disappointed" by this explosion, a short time will show!—perhaps few will experience any great "disappointment."

St. Petersburg, April 20.—Foreign journals reason a great deal about the approaching war with the Tartars. The matter is very simple.—The progressive advance of the Southern provinces of Russia demands the unconditional liberty of the Black Sea—an actual liberty, not a liberty depending only on Treaties which the Porte concludes to-day and breaks to-morrow. This liberty shall, Mr. Vaughan, and consolidated, as the freedom of the Baltic is, there may be a truce, but never peace, between Russia and the Porte."

UNITED STATES. NORTH EASTERN BOUNDARY LINE.

From the Washington National Journal.

MR. CLAY TO MR. VAUGHAN.

Rt. Hon. Charles R. Vaughan, &c. &c. The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, in acknowledging the receipt, on the 11th of this month, of a letter from you, in answer to that which the undersigned had the honor to address to him, transmitting the reports made by the agents of the United States and the State of Maine, would have restricted himself to a simple expression of his satisfaction with the engagement of Mr. Vaughan to lay the demand of the Government of the United States for the immediate liberation of John Baker, and a full indemnity for the injuries he had suffered by his arrest and detention, before the Government of Great-Britain. In doing this, he would, as much as possible, have avoided the discussion of the respective claims of the two countries to the disputed territory. If it were necessary to enter into that argument, it would not be difficult to maintain as clear a right, on the part of the United States, to the territory, as they have to any other portion of the territory which was acknowledged by Great-Britain to belong to them by the treaty of 1783. But, as by the arrangements between the two Governments, the question of right has received a different disposition, it is unnecessary to give particular consideration here to the respective claims of the two countries. It is not, however, to be forgotten, that the undersigned has had the honor of holding with Mr. Vaughan, on related to the intermediate possession, and to acts of jurisdiction within the disputed territory, until the right is finally settled. It would furnish a just occasion for previous acquiescence in the settlement of that question is an amicable progress, any misunderstanding should arise between the two Governments, in consequence of what must be regarded by the Government of the United States as the unwarrantable exercise of jurisdiction by the Government of the Province of New-Brunswick within the disputed territory."

The undersigned cannot concur in the opinion that the limits of the treaty of 1783 being undefined and unadjusted, the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the territory rests with Great-Britain until that portion of it designated in the treaty of 1783 shall have been finally set apart from the British possessions as belonging to the United States. Mr. Vaughan's argument assumes that some other act of settling the territory between the United States and those of Great-Britain, than the treaty of peace of 1783, was necessary; and that, until that other act should be performed, the United States could not be considered in possession. This argument would give to the United States the right to the territory which they acquired by the war of their Independence; the treaty of 1783 being the only act of separation in virtue of which they are in possession of their territory. If, at the conclusion of the treaty of 1783, Great-Britain had not exercised jurisdiction, or had exercised it in a manner which was not merely constructive possession, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed territory. But, while the actual possession of the territory was in the hands of the United States, and that actual possession had all along remained with her, Mr. Vaughan might have contended that the Government of Great-Britain had a right to exercise jurisdiction, de facto, over the disputed