

The Augusta Chronicle.

The editor of this paper thinks that we have, by "drawing false and erroneous conclusions from the premises," in reference to the use made of Judge Clayton's speech by M. Berryer, in the French Chamber of Deputies, "dealt unjustly with that gentleman." In reviewing the whole matter, aided by all the light which Mr. Pemberton has attempted to throw around it, we remain unconvicted of having done either the one or the other. What were our premises and conclusions on the subject? Why, that M. Berryer, one of the most talented and influential members of the French Chamber of Deputies—the individual to whose exertions and eloquence we are indebted for the first rejection of the Indemnity Bill by that body—in the course of his late Speech on the same subject, had quoted from the speech of Judge Clayton, and for what purpose? To arouse the jealousy and pride of the Chamber, by showing them that French honor was better understood in the United States than in France—that it was safer in the holy keeping of A. S. Clayton, than in the hands of the *degenerate* Representatives of le grand Nation. In doing this, his object could not have been to aid the passage of the bill, but to defeat it, for his whole soul was bent on its destruction—He surely would not have quoted the sentiments or arguments of Judge Clayton, if they were calculated to produce an influence contrary to his wishes. The Speech, it is true, in which M. Berryer introduces Judge C. to the notice of the French Chamber, was not on the main question—the final passage of the bill—but was, as Mr. Pemberton very well knows, in favor of a motion to postpone its consideration, which was the first step taken by himself and the enemies of the bill to prevent its passage. The object of M. Berryer was very well known, for he had always been looked upon as the leader of those who were opposed to the treaty—had before succeeded in defeating its execution—was at the time designated as one of those who would speak on the side of the opposition—and who finally exerted all his powers to prevent the passage of the bill, but thank fortune and the stern integrity of Andrew Jackson, without success—though fortified and backed by the opinions of Judge Clayton, he was unable to convince the high minded Deputies of France, that French honor, even "as understood in the United States," was above French magnanimity and justice.

The Chronicle further states, that "the course he (Judge Clayton) recommended as the most judicious for the government to pursue, although opposed at first, by gentlemen who did not possess his forecast and sagacity, was, nevertheless, ultimately adopted, in all its essential particulars, by the Congress of the U. S." Here we at once join issue with the Chronicle, and assert, that so far from Congress' ultimately adopting the very "judicious course" recommended by Judge C., the reverse is true. The policy he recommended, found no favor even with a large majority of the Whigs themselves. The "course recommended" by Judge C., "for the Government to pursue," was, that no legislative action should be

had on the subject at all—which policy he maintained resolutely, until after the last vote on Mr. Cambreleng's amended resolutions, when finding that the Congress of the U. S. was determined not to adopt his "judicious course," but to legislate strongly and pointedly on the subject, and feeling the "proud" situation of "being in a majority of one" not so comfortable as he had anticipated, he reluctantly ordered his vote to be recorded in favor of them, not because (as we have been informed) he believed them to be "judicious" or expedient, but because it was desirable that they should pass *unanimously*.

That this was the policy recommended by Judge Clayton, is clearly established from his amendment proposing to instruct the Committee to report, "that it is expedient to await the further action of the French Chamber, &c."

From his declaration pending the discussion of the resolutions reported by the Committee, "that he was opposed to all legislation on the subject, unless it was to adopt Mr. Archer's resolutions," declaring it "inexpedient to adopt any measure on the subject," &c.

And by his vote in favor of Col. Watmough's resolution "to lay the whole subject on the table."—This was the "judicious course" recommended by Judge Clayton, yet the Congress of the U. States pursued a different one. Both of its branches did act, and acted nobly too, on the subject, by telling France plainly and unequivocally, that "the treaty *must* be executed;" and yet, according to Mr. Pemberton's showing, it was the over and over again spurned and rejected "judicious course" recommended by Judge Clayton, that was "ultimately adopted," and saved the country from all the horrors of a "ruinous and sanguinary war!"

Much was said by the French party in Congress in vindication of French *honor*, against the insulting *threat* contained in Gen. Jackson's message. They declared that it would inevitably defeat the Treaty. Yet strange to say, they ultimately joined in both branches, in reiterating the *threat* by declaring, that "the treaty *must* be executed!" And now that the indemnity bill has passed the French Chamber, not only in despite of Gen. Jackson's threat but the *threat* of the Congress of the U. S.—they say it was *our* insult, and not the insult of *General Jackson*, that brought France to her senses—obtained the passage of the bill, and saved the country from all the horrors of "war, pestilence, and famine!"