

12/16
SPEECH *man*

OF

JOHN P. HALE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, *600*
E
407
432
1848
Bay

ON THE

INCREASE OF THE ARMY IN MEXICO.

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 6, 1848.

Mr. HALE said: Feeling compelled from my convictions of duty to take a course in reference to this bill in which I am aware very few Senators will entirely coincide, I have thought, humble as is the sphere in which I move, that it was due to those who placed me in the position I occupy, to let my vote upon the bill go out accompanied with the reasons which have induced me to take the course which I am about to take. I would have been glad if older and abler Senators had favored the Senate with their views in opposition to this bill. I would have been glad if the action of the Senate upon this bill had been delayed until the documents coming from the several Departments, and which we are well nigh getting, had been placed before us, so that we might have had all the light that could be thrown upon that, which in my mind is a dark subject at the highest; but seeing that the bill is likely to go through the forms of legislation, and become a law without having those lights before us, I have thought it necessary to trespass briefly upon the time of the Senate, in order to express the views which I entertain. It may be said that I do not stand in a position to be aided by light from any quarter, because I have already declared that I stand here prepared to vote against the war in all its forms; against any measures for the supply of troops, either regulars or volunteers, (and if there are any other kinds, I go against them,) because I stand prepared to vote against the appropriation of a single dollar beyond the simple amount—as I have before suggested—which will be sufficient to bring home your troops by the shortest and cheapest route. Entertaining these views, before entering upon the discussion of the bill, I want to say a word in regard to a sentiment which I have heard avowed here and elsewhere; and it is, that when the country is engaged in war we lose all discretion; we have nothing to do but grant the supplies that are demanded of us; an appeal being made to our patriotism, patriotism can only find rightful action in support of the war; that there is no patriotism any where else; and that the Administration, which has been so fortunate or unfortunate as to plunge the country into a war, has only to appeal to the country, and expect to receive no other response except hearty and unanimous support. And this doctrine has been carried so far, and in such high places, that the President of the United States has denounced as treason the opposition of Congress, although they believe the war to have been unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced, and prosecuted for purposes which their judgment condemns, and tending to the overthrow of our institutions of Government.

Towers, printer, corner of D and 7th sts. opposite National Intelligencer.

QUEEN ELIZABETH'S ADVICE.

I recollect but one incident in my reading of history which is analogous. It is stated by an English historian that when Queen Elizabeth had summoned her Parliament, and they were about to organize for business, she sent her messenger to them with this royal mandate: to be very careful that they did not meddle with affairs of State, "because," said she, "such things are altogether beyond the compass of your narrow understanding." Well, our royal President did not follow exactly in the footsteps of Elizabeth. He did not question the understanding of Congress, but their patriotism. Now, let us see where this doctrine will carry us. Let us see to what it will lead. Suppose you should have an exceedingly bad and corrupt Administration—mind, I do not say that this is such an Administration, or that we are ever likely to have such an one. I neither affirm nor deny aught on that matter; I only use the supposition for the purpose of illustrating my argument. But suppose that such a thing were possible, and that the measures of the President had become exceedingly odious, oppressive, burdensome, and intolerable, and that notes of disapprobation were beginning to be heard from the people assembled in their primary meetings; that the tones of indignation at last penetrate the walls of the palace, and the President, finding that he cannot stand against the united will of an injured people, begins to look about for the means of escaping from that torrent of popular odium which threatens to overwhelm him, what has he to do? To desist in his course of wrong-doing, or to retrace his steps? No, sir; this is not the path to popularity. According to his new school of ethics and morals, he has only to go on and plunge the country into war, and, if he can manage so skilfully as to involve the country into two wars at once, so much the better, so much the more glory for him; a popularity greater than that of Washington and Jackson! This is the inference, the plain and unmistakable inference. War, instead of being, as it is said to be by all writers on ethics or politics, the direst calamity which Heaven in its wrath can send upon a nation, is converted by this alchemy into a healing Bethesda, in which political profligacy and corruption of the darkest hue may wash itself and be clean.

CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE A VOICE.

Sir, I utterly deny the soundness of this doctrine that Congress ought to have no voice beyond granting the supplies. If there ever is a time when opposition should be vigilant, scrupulous, watchful, noticing everything that is wrong, it is at a time when, through the acts of the Administration, the country is burdened with an unnecessary war. When the peaceful pursuits of life are interrupted, the fruits of industry are consumed, the treasure of the nation wasted, and the lives of its citizens sacrificed for the support of such a war and the country involved in all the horrors which it brings in its train. If there ever is a time that should put men upon their individual judgment, reflection, and responsibility, it is such a time; and is not such our condition now? Primarily carried in the manner I propose hereafter to show, hastened and precipitated upon us by the unadvised, unconstitutional, and illegal acts of the President, I propose to do what I may, feeble as it may be, to place the country right. I have never learned in that school

of moral or political science, which teaches that, by persevering in the wrong, we shall ever come out right.

THE RESPONSIBILITY DIVIDED.

And, sir, there is another view that is sometimes taken, which certainly does not accord with my own convictions, and upon which I wish to say a word or two at this time, (and I do it with deference to the opinions of abler men about me,) and which relates to the course which those should take who believe the war to be wrong, radically wrong. I think I have heard an idea something like this: The country is engaged in a war which is unjustifiable—we confess it is wrong to go on, we see clearly it is wrong—nevertheless, we are now at war, and the President calls on us for supplies of men and money, and Senators say that they will vote men and money; but, by some sort of a process which escapes my comprehension, they imagine they are to throw the responsibility on the President. I confess I do not understand how they are to escape from responsibility; they must share the responsibility with the President, let the character of the act be what it may. If the war be wrong, put an end to it at once. I have no doubt the President will be exceedingly gratified with opposition of this kind. You will hear nothing about a factious opposition, in the organ of the Administration. The President would care little for the opposition of the whole world if it were of this kind. It is very like Sam Weller, who happened to find himself in prison, and a person whom he met was bewailing the misfortune of having a thousand pounds left to him by will, which circumstance had been the occasion of his imprisonment. "I wish," exclaimed Sam, "all my enemies would try to ruin me in that way." Just so with the President. You tell him he is wrong, while, at the same time, you vote him all the men and money that he asks you for.

Believing that the cause of this war is radically wrong, I hold it to be the first, the plainest, and the simplest duty to withhold supplies, and compel the President to do what we believe to be right. Believing there is a strict and pertinent analogy between the course to be pursued by Congress, and that which is taken by the British Parliament, I consider that the course of those who think the war wrong, is plain, clear, and admits of no mistake. Upon a question of voting supplies, the very first thing to be inquired into by Congress is, whether the object for which the supplies are demanded, is one which commends itself to the favorable consideration of Congress. If it be determined that the object is a proper one, let the supplies be granted; if otherwise, withhold them. This is my understanding of the nature of our Constitution. I have heard our Government spoken of, as a Government of checks and balances; but when you speak of the President having the power to make war unconstitutionally and illegally, I cannot understand the cause or propriety of that course of conduct which would sustain him in his unconstitutional act.

THE CAUSES OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

Believing, then, that the question of this war is a question which ought to be discussed; that it lies at the very bottom of the question of supplies, I will proceed to give my views to the Senate and the country. And, as I suggested the other day in the few remarks which I had the honor to sub-

mit, I believe that the cause of the war lies deeper than any that has been assigned by those who have expressed their opinions upon the subject. I believe that the question whether it arose from the march of General Taylor to the Rio Grande, or whether any of those incidental or temporary movements were the immediate cause of the war, is entirely irrelevant to the inquiry of what is its primary cause. The cause, sir, lies deeper than any of these; and when I speak of the causes of the war, permit me to say that I do it with no desire to introduce exciting or angry discussion, or to arouse unpleasant feeling; but, having a duty to perform here, I must do it fearlessly, as an American Senator, feeble as it may be. And when we speak of the causes of this war, I must avow my conviction, beyond a cavil or doubt, to be, that it lies in the avowed policy of the American Government—a policy which was avowed four years ago—to make the extension of human slavery one of its primary motives of action. And when I say this, let me not be misunderstood. I refer to the principle avowed in the diplomatic correspondence which preceded the annexation of Texas to the United States. And permit me to say, that, in approaching this question, I do it with a desire and a disposition to do full justice to the officers of this Government who were engaged in that correspondence. I will do them the justice to say that what they did they did manfully and above board. There was no concealment. They came out boldly. Their course was very different from that of a set of men we have among us called Northern men with Southern principles—men who profess to be against slavery, but who are nevertheless enlisted in the slaveholding interest, ready to do slavery's bidding. That was not the case with the men to whom I have referred. They came out boldly and avowed the object at which they aimed, and the means by which they proposed to attain it. Let this be ever said to their credit.

In that correspondence the objects of this Government are as evident, as much beyond controversy as any thing can possibly be. No, sir! If the fingers of a hand were sent from the throne of Eternal light to write this upon the wall over your head, it would not flash conviction more readily to the mind than is done by a perusal of that correspondence. I will not go through the whole of it, but will content myself with sending to the Clerk and asking him to read an extract from this letter:

Mr. Upshur to Mr. Murphy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 8, 1843.

SIR: A private letter from a citizen in Maryland, then in London, contains the following passage:

"I learn, from a source entitled to the fullest confidence, that there is now here a Mr. Andrews, deputed by the abolitionists of Texas to negotiate with the British Government; that he has seen Lord Aberdeen and submitted his *project* for the abolition of slavery in Texas; which is, that there shall be organised a company in England who shall advance a sum sufficient to pay for the slaves now in Texas, and receive in payment Texas lands; that the sum thus advanced shall be paid over as an indemnity for the abolition of slavery; and I am authorized by the Texan Minister to say to you that Lord Aberdeen has agreed that the British Government will guaranty the payment of the interest on this loan, upon condition that the Texan Government will abolish slavery."

This proposition, it will be seen, was exceedingly simple and easy to be understood. It announced not that there was a scheme on foot amongst a set of fanatical politicians to decoy away the slaves, not to steal them—nothing of that sort—but a proposition had been entertained by which the

Government and slaveholders of Texas agreed to abolish slavery; and, for this agreement on their part, it was said that a company had agreed to advance a stipulated price. What right had our Government to interfere? The Secretary says: "A movement of this sort cannot be contemplated in silence." I agree it should not; but what should every American heart have said when it was found that a scheme of this kind was on foot? Should they not have burst out in thankful aspirations to Almighty God that such a scheme of benevolence as that had even been thought of? I think the Secretary says well in saying that they could not look on in silence.

The Secretary further says: "Such an attempt upon any ~~un-ignoring~~ country would necessarily be viewed by this Government with very deep concern."

Certainly they should have looked on with deep concern—as deep as that with which affection watches by the side of dying love, now gathering hope from the symptoms that the smiles of health will again smooth the cheek of love, and then trembling lest the pall of despair should settle on its hopes.

Again he says: "It cannot be permitted to succeed without the most strenuous efforts on our part to arrest a calamity so serious to every part of our country." A calamity so serious to every part of our country; so serious to New Hampshire, to Massachusetts, and the other New England States! And, sir, this bill which is now before you is one of the measures which are to be adopted to redeem the pledge thus made. In the same letter it is said:

"The establishment, in the very midst of our slaveholding States, of an independent government, forbidding the existence of slavery, and by a people born for the most part among us, reared up in our habits, and speaking our language, could not fail to produce the most unhappy effects upon both parties."

When I saw it formally announced by the Government that it could not produce any but "unhappy effects," I thought that I was mistaken in the reading; I thought it must be a mistake of the printer; but I found that it was no mistake, that the announcement was really made. What a mistake then did the Pilgrim fathers make in coming to found a colony in the New World, where they might avoid the consequences of slavery! Had they not slavery enough at home? Did they bid farewell to every thing that bound their hearts to the land of their birth, the land where the bones of their fathers repose, and came over to found the institutions of American slavery? Was it for this that the Mayflower sailed from the coast where slavery prevailed? Was it for this that those patriots wandered from England to Holland, and from Holland here? In Heaven's name was not England oppressive enough? Again:

"Few calamities could befall this country more to be deplored than the establishment of a predominant British influence and the abolition of domestic slavery in Texas."

Few calamities could befall the country like this! I had understood, up to the time when I read this declaration, that the institution of slavery, for good or bad, was a State institution. I thought it was one which the General Government had no right to touch. Everything that I have ever heard upon the subject had tended to take that institution from the cognizance of the General Government, and make it exclusively a subject of

State policy ; but here I find it baptized, and made one of the Gods before which the whole people are to bow down and worship.

THE GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE.

Mr. Calhoun, in a letter to Mr. Green, dated Department of State, Washington, April 15, 1844, says : " The step (annexation of Texas) was forced on the Government of the United States in consequence of the policy of Great Britain in reference to the abolition of slavery in Texas." In the same letter he says the Government has taken this step " in full view of all possible consequences." Can this language be misunderstood? Was not war one of the possible consequences in full view of which this measure was adopted? But I forbear ; the whole correspondence is full of the most irrefragable proof of my position, and is familiar to the Senate and the country. From this cause, whether remote or immediate, this war proceeded. Can any man deny this? We may have our doubts whether, if there had been more caution and prudence, this war would have been precipitated upon us at so early a period. But is it not evident that the whole matter springs from this? Was not annexation itself an act of war? War was existing between Mexico and Texas at the time. By the very fact of annexing to ourselves one of the belligerent nations we incurred the responsibility of fighting her battles ; although, even after that, subsequent history has demonstrated that, owing to the feeble and distracted state of Mexico, the most ordinary prudence on the part of the Executive might and probably would have avoided flagrant war.*

HOW THE WAR COMMENCED.

If this, then, be the cause of the war, I come next to the question how this war commenced? Well, sir, it may seem exceedingly strange that one should be found asking that question at this time when the President has told us over and over again so many times how it commenced ; that it commenced by the act of Mexico. Said the President, in his message to Congress of the 11th May, 1846 :

" In my message at the commencement of the present session, I informed you that, upon the earnest appeal both of the Congress and convention of Texas, I had ordered an efficient military force to take a position ' between the Nueces and the Del Norte.' This had become necessary to meet a threatened invasion of Texas by the Mexican forces, for which extensive military preparations had been made. The invasion was threatened solely because Texas had determined, in accordance with a solemn resolution of the Congress of the United States, to annex herself to our Union ; and under these circumstances it was plainly our duty to extend our protection over her citizens and soil.

*That the war not only has its origin, as stated in the determination of our Government, to extend and perpetuate slavery, but is even now prosecuted, for no other object whatever, appears by the admission of Gen. Cass, the Chairman of the Committee of Military Affairs in the Senate, who, in a letter to A. O. P. Nicholson, Esq., dated December 24, 1847, among various reasons which he gives for being opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, gives his 3d reason as follows :

3. " Because I believe a general conviction, that such a proposition would succeed, would lead to an immediate withholding of the supplies, and thus to a dishonorable termination of the war. I think no dispassionate observer at the seat of Government, can doubt this result."

When the important position occupied by Gen. Cass is considered, this declaration of his must be considered as an authoritative declaration ; the war is to be no further prosecuted than while the addition, to this Union, of slave territory is probable.

" This force was concentrated at Corpus Cristi, and remained there until after I had received such information from Mexico as rendered it probable, if not certain, that the Mexican Government would refuse to receive our envoy.

" Meantime Texas, by the final action of our Congress, had become an interesting part of our Union. The Congress of Texas, by its act of December 19, 1836, had declared the Rio del Norte to be the boundary of that Republic. Its jurisdiction had been extended and exercised beyond the Nueces. The country between that river and the Del Norte had been represented in the Congress and in the convention of Texas; and thus taken part in the act of annexation itself, and is now included within one of our Congressional districts. Our own Congress had, moreover, with great unanimity, by the act approved December 31, 1845, recognised the country beyond the Nueces as a part of our territory by including it within our own revenue system, and a revenue officer, to reside within that district, has been appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It became, therefore, of urgent necessity to provide for the defence of that portion of our country. Accordingly, on the 13th of January last, instructions were issued to the general in command of these troops to occupy the left bank of the Del Norte."

And in his annual message to Congress on the 8th of December, 1846, he repeats the assertion, and he not only repeats the declaration that war exists by the act of Mexico, but he says every honorable effort has been made by him to prevent the war. But all proved in vain, and the war has come, notwithstanding he was so exceedingly opposed to it. Now I desire to examine this matter. The President is not satisfied with thus telling us that the war arose from the act of Mexico, and that he had used every honorable exertion to avoid it. He comes forward in his message this year, and tells us fourteen times distinctly, and several times impliedly, that it arose from the act of Mexico. It seems a part of the President's religion to accompany his more solemn acts with the continual declaration that "war exists by the act of Mexico," as it was of the followers of Mahommed to preface their more serious sayings with the oft-repeated avowal that there was "no God but Allah and Mahommed his prophet." Now let us examine this matter. Did it commence by the act of Mexico? Such is not my reading. The taking possession of Texas was of itself an act of war. Sir, at the time of the American Revolution, when France signed a treaty of alliance with us, Great Britain was not long in finding out that that was an act of war. But suppose that act was not one of war, what follows?

BOUNDARY—OREGON—PRESIDENT POLK'S YOUTH.

One of the fundamental conditions of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States was war.

"First said State to be formed subject to the adjustment by this Government of all questions of boundary.

"Subject to the adjustment of all questions of boundary." That was the very first condition which the American Congress fixed to the act of annexation. Well, is it necessary for me to stand here to-day to tell the American people that if there is a question of boundary existing, and one party goes and occupies the territory to the extreme verge of the claim, that is an act of war? Why, I think the President himself, in the course of the controversy with Great Britain, must have found that this was the case, although one of the first acts of his administration was to tell the people in his inaugural address that our title to Oregon was clear and unquestionable. I saw the President, amid the dripping of the storm, standing at the east front of this Capitol, reminding the people how young a man he

was, and yet he would have the whole of Oregon. I almost expected to hear him say—

“ You'd scarce expect one of my age
To speak in public on the stage.”

I know not whether I was most amused at the juvenility of the President or his determination to seize upon the whole of Oregon. He would not even submit the question to arbitration, because that would be admitting that Great Britain had some sort of title there. Nothing short of the whole would satisfy him. Why, a man could hardly be recognised as a democrat in the Eastern States, unless he was for claiming the whole of Oregon. He must go for 54° 40' or he was no democrat; and one State Legislature was so violent in the cause that they were for claiming 54° 49'. I wonder it never occurred to the President to send our officers and take possession of the territory up to that line. Why did he not do this? Because he knew, and every body knew, it would be an act of war. He knew it would be so considered by Great Britain and resented by her. Well, so it was here. The sending of General Taylor to the Rio Grande was, beyond all controversy, an act of war. But I propose to give you the President's own account of it. In his message of May, 1846, he says he kept the troops at Corpus Christi until it was rendered certain that the Mexican Government had refused to receive Mr. Slidell. Well, on the 10th day of November this commission was appointed, and, not being much acquainted with matters of diplomacy, I of course take what the President said as being what he meant.

Mr. Slidell's Letter of Credence.

JAMES K. POLK,

President of the United States of America.

GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: I have made choice of JOHN SLIDELL, one of our distinguished citizens, to reside near the Government of the Mexican Republic in the quality of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America. He is well informed of the relative interests of the two countries, and of our sincere desire to restore, cultivate, and strengthen friendship and good correspondence between us; and, from a knowledge of his fidelity and good conduct, I have entire confidence that he will render himself acceptable to the Mexican Government by his constant endeavors to preserve and advance the interest and happiness of both nations. I, therefore, request your excellency to receive him favorably, and to give full credence to whatever he shall say on the part of the United States. And I pray God to have you in his safe and holy keeping!

Written at the City of Washington, the tenth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-five, and of the independence of the United States the seventieth.

Your good friend,

By the President:

JAMES K. POLK.

JAMES BUCHANAN, Secretary of State.

To his Excellency DON JOSE JOAQUIM HERRERA, President of the Mexican Republic.

“ And pray God to have you in his holy care and keeping.” How pious the President is! He prays for his enemies. This was written on the 10th of November. Now, I want to read another document, to show how Mr. Polk was treating his good friend on the 15th of June preceding. In a confidential communication from the War Department, dated June 15, 1845, to Gen. Taylor, I find the following:

“ The point of your ultimate destination is the western frontier of Texas, where you will select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande del Norte, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and will be best adapted to repel invasion and to protect what, in the event of an-

nexation, will be our western border. You will limit yourself to the defence of the territory of Texas, unless Mexico should declare war against the United States.

"Your movements to the Gulf of Mexico, and your preparations to embark for the western frontier of Texas, are to be made without any delay."

THE PIOUS PRESIDENT—A WITNESS.

Well, now, what do you think of this pious President? On the 15th of June he ordered the troops to be ready to embark for the coast of Mexico, and five months afterwards he sends a message to General Herrera, and by the hands of this messenger a supplication to Almighty God "to have him in his safe and holy keeping!" Lest this prayer should fail, he had taken the precaution to send General Taylor with his army, five months before, to take him in his care and keeping! Well, I will not detain the Senate long on this part of the matter. It seems to me it is too plain for cavil; and, if I had the issue to be tried before twelve good men and true, the first witness I would call would be James K. Polk; for I never knew a witness who was conscious of telling the truth who found it necessary to repeat so often the same assertion. Why does the President go into so long and labored an effort to prove that we had good cause of war? If this were the case, and we had not commenced it, instead of being to our credit it would have been a disgrace to us: it would have shown us a pusillanimous nation. It is, therefore, a *felo de se* of his argument. Because, if this were the case, it shows that we should have done what the President has labored to show we have not done. The President may conquer Mexico, but he can never succeed in conquering the truth. He may direct as many guns to bear upon it as it would require to silence a Mexican battery, but he will not be successful.

WHAT ARE WE TO GAIN BY THE WAR?

Well, if this was the cause of the war; if this was the manner in which the war commenced, what are we carrying it on for now? What do we propose? What do we want? Why, in the message of the President to Congress, in 1846, he tells us that it was not conquest that he desired; but in the message of this year he modifies it a little. Now, the conquest he disavows; that is, he does not mean to take the whole of Mexico. I suppose that he means to divide it, very much as Lord Aberdeen divided Oregon with him, to take what he wants and leave the rest. He says: "It was never contemplated by me to make a permanent conquest of Mexico, or to destroy her nationality." Well, sir, actions speak louder than words, and I need not admonish gentlemen on this floor of this fact, for I have proof in my hand. What does the President tell you? I heard it asserted by a Senator the other day that Senators voted for the appropriation of the war under a protest; that they did it for nothing else than to relieve Gen. Taylor from the critical position in which he was placed. The President came and made the thrilling announcement that American blood had been shed on American soil. And while every heart palpitated at such an outrage, Senators, anxious to relieve General Taylor, were now willing to vote the supplies required, even though the bill for raising them was accompanied by the declaration which, at that time they believed to be untrue, that

“war existed by the act of Mexico.” They gave their votes under the protest that it was expressly for the relief of General Taylor. And what does the President now say to those Senators? Why, he says you did not mean any such thing. You could not have meant it. You knew that indemnity must be acquired. Senators, when you passed that vote, you all meant to get territory. The President has said so. He is your Executive officer: surely he ought to know; and the President has a right to say it, because actions speak louder than words. You voted him the men and the money; you gave him the sword and the purse, and you gave him unlimited license to conduct the war as he pleased; and now you must pass this bill, give him the ten regiments of regulars, and afterwards twenty regiments of volunteers, and let him thus, according to the Senator from Kentucky, increase his available forces in Mexico to ninety thousand, and go on subjugating that country. And what will he tell you at the next session? He now tells you:

POLK'S NOOSE TO INVOLVE CONGRESS

“Congress could not have meant—when in May, 1846, they appropriated ten millions of dollars, and authorised the President to employ the military and naval forces of the United States, and to accept the services of fifty thousand volunteers to enable him to prosecute the war; and when, at their last session, and after our army had invaded Mexico, they made additional appropriations, and authorised the raising of additional troops for the same purpose—that no indemnity was to be obtained from Mexico at the conclusion of the war; and yet it was certain that, if no Mexican territory was acquired, no indemnity could be obtained.

“It is further manifest that Congress contemplated territorial indemnity from the fact that at their last session an act was passed, upon the Executive recommendation, appropriating three millions of dollars with that express object. This appropriation was made ‘to enable the President to conclude a treaty of peace, limits, and boundaries with the Republic of Mexico, to be used by him in the event that said treaty, when signed by the authorized agents of the two Governments, and duly ratified by Mexico, shall call for the expenditure of the same, or any part thereof.’ The object of asking this appropriation was distinctly stated in the several messages on the subject which I communicated to Congress.”

Vote him now the men and money he now asks, and what will he tell you at the next session? Why, that Congress intended to overrun all Mexico! He will say, you meant that I should carry destruction throughout the whole of that country; that

“I should dip my sword in blood, and write my name
On desolate lands and cities.”

And he would have a right to say so. Vote him the men and the money he wants; let him have ninety thousand troops there, and he will enact scenes that perhaps we little think of; and at the next session he will come and tell us that that was what we meant, and he will have a right to do so, because actions speak louder than words. We certainly, in giving our votes, must be supposed to have some object to attain—that object the President can construe for himself.

In regard to the amendment which has been proposed to this bill, instead of making it better, it leaves it more obnoxious still. It leaves it to the President's discretion whether to embody these troops or not; but that is the very thing we ought not to do. He has had discretion enough. Was it not at his discretion that our troops were marched to the Rio Grande? It seems to me that the true course is to take the discretion into our own hands, and make specific appropriations for specific objects. Then we shall know for what objects they are made.

“INDEMNITY AND SECURITY.”

But the President says now he does not want the conquest of the whole of Mexico, but he wants *indemnity and security*. Well, these are words easily pronounced. But we had a good old lesson in New England, requiring the definition of words to be given. Indemnity for what? Security for what? I find the indemnity he wanted was not only indemnity for our claims, and for all the expenses of the war, but, in addition to all this, he wanted to drive a bargain with them; he was not willing to make peace unless they would sell him a part of their country with its inhabitants; for I read in the 5th and 6th articles of the treaty proposed by our Government to Mexico as follows, viz :

“ Art. 5. In consideration of the extension of the limits of the United States, as they are defined by the preceding article, and by the stipulations which are further contained in article 8, the United States abandon forever against the United Mexican States all reclamation on account of the costs of this war; and, besides, agree to pay to the United Mexican States, in the city of Mexico, the sum of ————.”

“ Art. 6. In full consideration of the stipulations contained in articles 4 and 8 of this treaty, the United States agree to assume and pay all sums at present due to claimants, and those which may be hereafter established, according to the convention concluded between the two Republics, in the city of Mexico, on the 20th of January, 1843, to provide for the payment of what shall be decided in favor of the claimants, according to a convention between the United States and the Mexican Republic, on the 11th of April, 1839. And the United States equally agree to assume and pay all reclamations of citizens of the United States against the Government of the United Mexican States not previously decided, to an amount not exceeding three millions of dollars, which have arisen prior to the 13th of May, 1846, and which shall be adjudged to be due by a commission established by the Government of the United States, whose decision shall be definitive and conclusive: *Provided, always,* That, in deciding on the validity of the said demands, the commission shall be guided and governed by the principles and rules prescribed by the first and fifth articles of the unratified convention, concluded in the city of Mexico on the 20th of November, 1843, and in no case shall they give judgment in favor of any claim not embraced by these principles and rules. And the United States, for the present and the future, exonerate the United Mexican States from any of the said demands whatsoever, which may be admitted or rejected by said board of commissioners.”

He requires payment of our unliquidated claims; he requires the expenses of the war, and, in addition to these, he requires that they shall sell him just as much territory as he sees fit to buy at his own price; this is the indemnity and security he wants. Are Senators prepared to sanction these views? Can they face the indignation of the world after having insisted on them? Here is a Government enfeebled, broken down; a people distracted, having a natural attachment to the homes of their birth; to the soil beneath which moulder the bones of their fathers; and because they do not choose to sell their country and themselves, the President says the war must be prosecuted and carried into the vital parts of Mexico. Well, now, the course of the President seems to be decidedly reprehensible. Perhaps I have commented upon it in a manner not quite becoming to this place. I hope not.

POLK NOT FOR WAR IN ALL CASES.

I cannot help remarking, in justice to him, that he has not shown a disposition for war in all cases. I think, in the management of the Oregon treaty, he exhibited meekness to a surprising degree. But he did not inherit the blessing of the meek. He did not get the land. He would not submit to arbitration. Well, how did he settle it?

Let Mr. Pakenham, the British Minister, tell his own story:

“WASHINGTON, JUNE 13, 1846.

“MY LORD; In conformity with what I had the honor to state in my despatch (No. 68) of the 7th instant, the President sent a message on Wednesday last to the Senate, submitting for the opinion of that body the draught of a convention for the settlement of the Oregon question, which I was instructed by your Lordship's despatch (No. 19) of the 18th of May, to propose for the acceptance of the United States.

“After a few hours' deliberation on each of the three days, (Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday,) the Senate, by a majority of 38 votes to 12, adopted yesterday evening a resolution advising the President to accept the terms proposed by Her Majesty's Government. The President did not hesitate to act on this advice, and Mr. Buchanan accordingly sent for me this morning, and informed me that the conditions offered by Her Majesty's Government were accepted by the Government of the United States, without the addition or alteration of a single word.

“I have the honor to be, &c

“R. PAKENHAM.

“The Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.”

Mark Mr. Pakenham's significant close of his letter—“without the addition or alteration of a single word!” This was too cruel in Lord Aberdeen; he ought to have let the President add that “war existed by the act of Mexico.” But no; he must take it just as the British Cabinet dictated it; and that, too, notwithstanding he had, in his inaugural, declared it to be his “duty to assert and maintain by all constitutional means, the right of the United States to that portion of our territory which lies beyond the Rocky Mountains. Our title to the country of the Oregon is clear and unquestionable.” Of this territory, our title to which was clear and unquestionable, he peaceably gives up to Great Britain a tract extending five hundred miles on the seacoast, and back to the Rocky mountains, by a treaty proposed by that Government, “without the addition or alteration of a single word.” He takes it just exactly as it was cooked up for him, very much as sick children are directed to do when they have an unpalatable dose of medicine to take; “shut your eyes and open your mouth and down with it.” Now I have not a word to say against the settlement of the Oregon question; but it seems to me that it would have read a little better in history, if it had not been preceded by so much blustering and bragging. And it was a little amusing to see the effect it had on our Eastern Democracy. The man who did not go for $54^{\circ} 40'$ was a Federalist, a traitor; and some were so zealous that they even got up to $54^{\circ} 49'$. Upon them the treaty came like a thunderclap, and they had to reverse the steam so suddenly that it came nigh producing a fatal collapse in the party.

But, sir, the President is not so entirely warlike in his nature as his conduct to Mexico would indicate; he has other and milder qualities; he surely has none of that ferocious spirit, characterized by the poet as—

“That stern joy which warriors feel
In foemen worthy of their steel.”

And in the selection of an adversary, he has surely displayed great prudence, which is said to be the better part of valor. It is a colder country at $54^{\circ} 40'$.

Now, if right in the position I have taken here, the question is, what is the duty of the American Senate? What are they to do? To go on and vote these ten regiments? The honorable Senator from Kentucky the other day said he did not know why regulars were preferred to volunteers. I do not know that I do. But Yankees guess sometimes.

War is to be made, sir, not only upon Mexico, but on the free laborers of the country, and the first onslaught is to be made in the shape of a tax on

tea and coffee; and it is the patronage which the creation of these ten regiments is to give him which he thinks will enable him to effect it; and the President has probably come to the conclusion, taught by the experience of the past, that, with the patronage of ten regiments at his command, "*some things may be done as well as others.*"

ARE SENATORS AFRAID TO OPPOSE AN UNJUST WAR?

I think the Senator from Kentucky, with his great acumen, may discover why the President prefers regulars.

Well, why cannot Senators who think with me that the war is wrong, radically wrong, come out and declare so by their votes? Why sit here denouncing the President, and then be guilty of the inconsistency—with all deference I say it—of voting men and money to carry on the war? Why, it is said it would be unpopular to withhold the supplies. Are we afraid to trust the people with a question of right? Sir, I think those who are afraid to trust the people, underrate them. Are men afraid to do that which is right because it may not be popular? Sir, it is this ghost of the unpopularity of opposition to the war which seems to sit like a nightmare upon American statesmen. Sir, I think there was more truth than poetry in what was said by a Western man. He said he got caught by opposing the last war, and he did not mean to get caught again—he intended now to go for war, pestilence, and famine. And I think there is a good deal of that feeling in the country. Men are afraid to take a bold stand.

It is said the people have already decided this matter; that they have settled that the war shall be prosecuted. I deny it entirely. I do not believe it. People have settled it! I have never met among the people one in ten who thought the war was right, or thought that it would be right further to prosecute it.

I believe, sir, that the heart of this whole people is sick of this miserable temporizing policy, which is putting justice, and right, and truth out, in order that expediency may walk in and govern, control, and direct our actions. I wish that the experiment may be tried by Congress of acting and voting on this matter according to the convictions of their own understanding, as expressed by themselves, when they speak of the character of this war. I listened the other day with great pleasure to the remarks of the honorable Senator from South Carolina. I trust I heard with profit the suggestion which he threw out when speaking on his resolutions. But I confess that I was somewhat astonished that a man of his great experience—his vast learning—his keen observation—could really think that there could be any virtue in the passage of these resolutions. I would like indeed, to see those resolutions passed, not that I think their passage would do any good in the present emergency, but they might, if adopted, serve as a sort of landmark, showing with what rapidity and what proclivity we have travelled the road to ruin; but that there would be any virtue in them I have not the least idea. Pass these resolutions unanimously in both branches of Congress, and let the President append to them his usual declaration, that the war was commenced by Mexico; nay, you may go beyond that, and with all the forms and solemnities with which you could embody them, you may make them part of the written fundamental constitution of the

land, and what would they be worth? Not the paper upon which they are written; for the very moment that they stood in the way of a popular majority, they would be utterly set at naught. He that is not persuaded of that, has not read, it seems to me, the first primer of our history. I think that the resolutions themselves contain much that is just and true, and that the passage of them might be of some consequence in the way which I have suggested, but that their passage would check the downward tendency of affairs, is altogether out of the question.

THE PEOPLE DESIRE THEM TO DO RIGHT.

I believe that the people desire us to go right, and that we have not faith enough in the people. Nothing is more common than to find aspirants for public favor flattering the people, and continually praising their intelligence and patriotism, and every thing which gives value and dignity to the human character. But you do not find these eulogists of the public virtue at all prepared to venture a little upon the intelligence which they vaunt so much. There is faith in expediency, in policy, in every thing but justice, truth, and right.

The present is, I believe, a critical period in our history. I believe that it is presumptuous in us to affirm, as the President has affirmed in his message, that the great question of the capability of man for self-government has been settled. It is not settled, sir. We are now settling it. Whether the manner in which we are settling it, will favorably or unfavorably affect the condition of mankind hereafter, yet remains to be seen in the future. We are settling the question, not only for ourselves, but for all who are to come after us. If here the experiment of self-government should fail, who can estimate the consequences to our race? We are to-day writing our history; we are impressing that little space which we occupy between the past and the future, with footsteps which will be indelible. Whither are those footsteps now tending? Shall those who are to succeed us find that the course which we are now pursuing lead to the broad fields of liberty, of peace, and of prosperity? Or shall it be that we are only erecting monuments marking the by-paths that lead to the pitfalls of destruction? These are questions that must come home to the heart of every man who loves his country and prizes its free institutions, and sees the dangers which now threaten them. Are we so blind, so fanatical, so stupid as to believe that the great laws of the physical and moral world are to be reversed in our favor? Are we emphatically the children of destiny? Can we take our destiny in our own hands and control it? Not so. It seems to me that there is a light streaming down the pathway of ages illuminating the destiny of nations, and that it is written, in glaring characters, retribution. It is a law in operation all around us, in the physical, moral, and political world. It is true of nations, as of individuals, "whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap." I would ask those disposed to look at this question in the light of history, to go back, and by its aid trace the long vista of ages that have elapsed; let them go back, if they will, to the morning of creation, when all the sons of God shouted together for joy, that Almighty Power had spoken a new world into being; and they will not find it recorded in any page of that history, that any nation ever sowed the

seeds of war and slavery, and reaped the fruits of peace and liberty. No, that passage remains to be written, and it requires no very great effort of the imagination to fancy that we can now hear the voice of all nations of the past sounding a solemn warning in our ears. Let us beware lest that fate which has constantly followed such a course of policy, may not soon be ours.

NEW HAMPSHIRE "*DEMOCRATIC*" FANATICISM.

I have thus endeavored to discharge my duty. I am quite aware of the imperfection of the effort. But before I conclude I wish to say a single word personal to myself, and to let you know, sir, and the Senate know, that if it be fanaticism which I have uttered, I am not alone responsible for it. It is not peculiar to myself, sir, nor those with whom I act. We had, a year or so ago, in the State of New Hampshire, a pair of Democratic organs, and it was rather doubtful whether they were entirely harmonious. But in May these New Hampshire "patriots" came together—they had an annexation—and when they came together they undertook to define the true Democratic faith upon this very doctrine of slavery. I read from the "New Hampshire Patriot" of 27th of May, 1847, from an article entitled, in capitals, "**WHICH IS THE PRO-SLAVERY PARTY?**"

"It is well known, as a general thing, in the slave States, the Democrats are the most favorable to the abolition of Slavery."

Again :

"The Democratic party of the South contains the men and the elements which are operating to the amelioration of the condition of the slaves, and will ultimately accomplish the overthrow of the institution of slavery."

Again :

"The Federal party is the pro-slavery party."

Sir, that was the "New Hampshire Patriot Democracy," last May. I do not undertake to say what it is now. Our annual election is near at hand, and I have not seen the official organ for some weeks. So, if I am fanatical, I am not without authority for my fanaticism; and a man may, it seems, entertain all the sentiments which I have advanced without being cast out of the pale of the Democracy as it is now organized. But I leave the subject. I thank the Senate for the patience, kindness, and candor with which I have been heard. It is no pleasant duty that I have performed. It is not agreeable to my feelings to occupy the place of an Ishmaelite here; my hand being against every man's, and every man's hand against mine. If any remarks have fallen from me offensive to the feelings of a single Senator, of which I am wholly unconscious, I can assure him from the bottom of my heart that they were altogether unintentional. I have endeavored to deal with principles and measures, not with men. I believe that the institutions of the country are endangered. I believe that the course in which we are proceeding, unless our career be arrested, will most inevitably conduct us to destruction; and I have thrown out these suggestions in the hope of doing something, however feeble the attempt, in order to excite correct public sentiment on this all-vital question.

ADDITIONAL FACTS.

To fill up a blank page, the following facts are added in relation to the origin of the War:

Among the prominent men who denounced Annexation, was the great William Ellery Channing, of Boston, who, in 1836, in a letter of great earnestness and cogency, denounced the whole Texas conspiracy, and its obvious purposes, as calculated to cover us with infamy. In this letter Dr. Channing says:

"To annex Texas is to declare perpetual war with Mexico. The seizure of Texas will not stand alone. It will darken our future history. It will be linked by an iron necessity to long-continued deeds of rapine and blood. Ages may not see the catastrophe of the tragedy, the first scene of which we are so ready to enact."

This was no outburst of fanaticism, but the calm dictate of an enlightened understanding and conscience. Its substance was affirmed by a unanimous vote of the Massachusetts Legislature, so late as 1843, and, in general terms, by public bodies and the Press throughout the Free States, down to 1844.

In April, 1844, Mr. Clay, in utter ignorance of Mr. Van Buren's letter, wrote from Raleigh to the National Intelligencer a frank and brief exposition of his own reasons for opposing the Annexation scheme, whence the following is an extract:

"Mexico has not abandoned, but perseveres in the assertion of her right, [to Texas,] by actual force of arms, which, if suspended, are intended to be renewed. Under these circumstances, if the Government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would acquire all the incumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. Of that consequence there cannot be a doubt. *Annexation and War with Mexico are identical.* Now, for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the sake of acquiring Texas," &c.

Between the writing and the publication of this letter, while we were all ignorant of its existence, a great meeting of the citizens of New York was held at the Tabernacle, to enter a solemn protest against the Annexation business, then pending. All parties united in it; the Whig party with entire unanimity, with all that pretended to keep a conscience among the Democrats. The chair was taken by the venerable Albert Gallatin, the most eminent citizen of New York, and the highest authority on International Law among us. That meeting, after full deliberation, unanimously

"Resolved, That the Annexation of Texas to this Union, as now contemplated, would, according to the acknowledged laws of nations, be a *positive Declaration of War against Mexico—a War of Conquest and an unjust War*, in which this nation would be supported by no sense of right, and be condemned by the unanimous voice of the civilized and Christian world."

ELECTION EXCERPTS—1840-1844.

In 1840 General Harrison received	-	1,269,763	votes.
In 1844 Mr. Clay received	-	1,288,533	votes.

Exceeding General Harrison's vote	-	18,770	votes.
-----------------------------------	---	---------------	--------

In 1844 the vote for Clay and Birney exceeded that of Mr. Polk 23,471 votes, clearly showing that Mr. Polk was elected by a *minority*, and not a majority of the PEOPLES' votes.