EDITED BY THOMAS RITCHIE.

THOMAS RITCHIE & JOHN P. HEISS,
PROPRIETORS AND PUBLISHERS.

TERMS:

DAILY, per year, ... $10 00
SEMI-WEEKLY, (published tri-weekly during the session of Congress) 6 00
WEEKLY, ... 2 00

Clubs will be furnished as follows:

Five copies of the DAILY, for 40 00
Five copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY, ... 20 00
Ten copies of the " " 35 00
Five copies of the WEEKLY, ... 8 00
Ten copies of the " 15 00

The Daily Union.

VOLUME IV. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 14.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 17, 1848.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The name of no person will be entered upon our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.

Distant subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage on which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in its safe transmission.

The COUNTRY PAPER is published tri-weekly during the sessions of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on terms proportioned to the above annual rates.

A postmaster's certificate of remittance in payment for subscriptions or advertisements will be a sufficient receipt therefor. The notes of any specie-paying bank will be received.

☞ POSTMASTERS are authorized to act as our agents; and, by sending us FIVE DAILY subscribers, with $50 enclosed; or five SEMI-WEEKLY subscribers, with $25 enclosed; or five WEEKLY subscribers, with $10 enclosed, will be entitled to one copy of the same edition as they furnish us subscribers for, gratis.

☞ THE CONGRESSIONAL REGISTER will be furnished them on *the same terms.*

CONGRESSIONAL.

SPEECH OF MR. BREESE,

OF ILLINOIS.

In Senate, Feb. 14, 1848.—On the Mexican question, and the ten-regiment bill.

The Senate having resumed the consideration of the bill to raise, for a limited time, an additional military force—

Mr. BREESE said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I never rise in this presence, upon the most ordinary occasion, either to explain or defend a measure purely local in its character, without some embarrassment; and that feeling is greatly increased, as you may well suppose, when questions of vital importance to the nation are under discussion, calling forth, as those have, connected with this bill, the best efforts of the most distinguished members of this body. Nothing, sir, but an overwhelming sense of the duty I owe to the State which has honored me so much, and whose patriotism has been so signally exhibited from the very commencement of this war, and whose people take the deepest interest in its progress and success, could have broken the silence I had imposed upon myself, so far as the mere object of the bill itself is concerned. It is upon those great topics, which throw the bill quite into the shade, that I wish to express my opinions fully and without reserve—premising, however, that they are my own individual opinions, for which neither the administration, nor any member of it, nor the party with which I act, are in the slightest degree responsible. They have been formed after much careful deliberation and anxious inquiry, and with a desire solely to arrive at correct conclusions; and if they are unsound, or of wicked and dangerous tendency, or impracticable, they will find no echo in the public heart, and influence in no degree the public judgment. My State, sir, has a right to this expression from me, to enable it to judge if I properly sustain here the important relation their partiality has created between us, and if I fully meet all the responsibilities which it imposes upon me. I have said, sir, that the people of that great and patriotic State take the most lively interest in this war, and in all the questions connected with it; and look with confidence and hope to some grand achievement as its final result. From its inception, on the first call to arms to repel the aggressive act of Mexico, and to punish her for her injustice and her wanton invasion of our territory, the people there, with one heart and one mind, were found on the side of their country, the only strife among them being a generous rivalry as to who could best serve it in the hour of its need. Eight thousand of its choicest chivalry offered themselves at the call, of whom four thousand were accepted, who repaired at once to the field, with an alacrity never before manifested, and in the campaign which followed, covered themselves with undying glory.

It was my fortune, sir, to be addressing the Senate at the last session, on the three-million bill, on the very day of the hard-fought battle of Buena Vista, when my thoughts, as they had often done before, turned to those noble spirits, my neighbors and my friends, who had left all the fond endearments of home—severing those dear family ties they knew so well how to appreciate—to do battle for their country in a foreign land, inspired only by the fervor of a generous patriotism, when I was prompted thus to speak of them:

"They have proved, by the sufferings they have endured by disease, and by performing the most wonderful marches in modern times—advancing forty miles in a day, bivouacking at night with half rations, and showing, by their discipline and prompt obedience to orders, that they can be relied upon in any and every emergency; and though it has been denied them to participate in the perils of the battle-field, they have given the strongest assurances, that in it they would not fail to reap a full harvest of glory."

That prophecy, sir, was at that very moment fact. At that very hour they were gathering glory at the cannon's mouth; and so long as Buena Vista shall be a familiar word—so long as the mountains there, in whose sight they fought and fell, shall lift their summits to the sky, so long will the valorous deeds of the gallant Illinoians be remembered and rehearsed. At Cerro Gordo, too, sir, they exhibited like evidences of gallantry—exalting by their deeds not only the character of their State, but of the whole country, to which they had so signally manifested their devotion. These troops, sir, were of the best blood of the State, composed of gentlemen of character at home, each one of whom, in battle, felt as if he had not only the character of his country to sustain, but his own individual character; and that made them then—as they will be ever—invincible. And, sir, so far as the immediate object of this bill is concerned, and in answer to the remark that the troops cannot be raised by it in any reasonable time, I should not fear to pledge myself that, on its being known that it had become a law, one-half of the whole number can be there instantly raised, of the same material, and under the same inspiration. The people of that State, sir, are fully impressed with the justice of this war; and the denunciations indulged in here and elsewhere against the Executive as its author, will have no effect upon them to turn them to peace, or to oppose the government in any of its measures to carry it on vigorously in the very heart of the enemy's country; and they are not to be appalled at the unfortunate results which, in the opinion of some senators, may flow from it, nor can they be made to think they will be so dreadful as they have been depicted. I had hoped, Mr. President, from indications which I thought I saw when this bill was first reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, that it would receive the general assent of this body; and that those denunciations, to which we have listened so long, would have been reserved for some more favorable occasion, when the progress of no great public measure would be impeded by them, and a better opportunity afforded for the most unlimited discussion, and the widest range of debate; but in this I have been disappointed; and, at the hazard of further delay, I must endeavor to repel these assaults, and place the administration, and those who support it, right before the country, and furnish a justification for their and our conduct. Senators need not think this war is unpopular; in this they deceive themselves. Every successful war is popular; and bold declarations that this is unjust and unconstitutionally commenced will not satisfy those who are to pass upon our conduct. The people, sir, will not be deluded by such declarations; they will require of those who make them to sustain them by facts, by reasoning, and by fair argument; and I call upon senators on the other side of the chamber to demonstrate, if they can, with all their legal acumen, acknowledged ability, and power of investigation, why it is that the war is unjust and unconstitutionally commenced? They will reply, that it was by the removal of our troops to the bank of the Rio Grande; that such removal was an act of war; and being ordered by the President, he acted therein in a manner not warranted by the constitution. This allegation involves, necessarily, the consideration of the question of boundary; and if it has been established—as I think it has been—that the river was the true and only boundary of Texas, the right to have our forces there, to prevent a threatened invasion, cannot be controverted. And here, sir, it will not be necessary to discuss this point at length, inasmuch as the argument of my honorable colleague upon it [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been most clear and convincing. He has shed such a flood of light upon it—has so brilliantly illuminated it—that none can any longer be in error, or go astray, except from mere design and wanton perversity. I accord with him, sir, fully, in all his views on that point; and to show, sir, that it is not a sudden opinion and hastily formed, I beg leave to quote a few passages from the speech I had the honor to deliver in June, 1844, on the resolutions of the honorable senator of Missouri, [Mr. BENTON,] pending the treaty of annexation. After stating the principal facts connected with the history of Mexico and Texas, I said:

"In 1835, Santa Anna, then a victorious general, abandoning the cause of republicanism, declared in favor of a central government by which the sovereignty of the States was, in effect, abolished, and all power, civil and military, consolidated in one man. Many of the States, as all 'the old thirteen' did, took up arms in defence of their rights and their sovereignty, as guaranteed by the federative system of 1824. But the power of the usurper was irresistible. State after State was subdued, until finally, save in Texas alone of all the Mexican States, the sacred fire of liberty was extinguished; there alone it was guarded with anxious vigilance. Texas refused to submit to the dictator, and resort was had by the people to resist his power to the same means our ancestors adopted, to free themselves from colonial vassalage and maintain their independence. They never abandoned the federal constitution of Mexico, so long as a hope remained of its triumph, but battled manfully for it throughout the year 1835; and in many a hard-fought conflict the Texans were victorious. At the close of that year, a solemn declaration of the delegates of the people was published, in which it is asserted that they had recourse to arms in defence of the republican principles of the federal constitution of 1824; that they would adhere with fidelity to the Mexican confederacy so long as it should be governed by the constitution and laws adopted for the protection of their political rights; and appealing to other members of the confederacy, pledged their aid to such of them as would resist the military despotism then being established within their borders. No other State but Texas dared to resist; and she, unaided and alone, having no France to come to her assistance, as we had, defied and resisted the power of the usurper. A new convention of the people assembled on the 1st of March, 1836; and although the country was invaded by Santa Anna, at the head of a numerous army, the Alamo at Bexar taken by assault—though gallantly defended by a handful of men under the command of the brave Travis, Crocket, and Bowie, who were all put to death; Fanning and his force captured, and treacherously and inhumanly massacred, and desolation brooding over Texas; in the midst of all this, a regularly organized convention assembled, and published their 'Declaration of Independence,' formed a constitution to be submitted to the people for their approval, and in fifty days thereafter—on the 21st of April, on the banks of the San Jacinto—proved their ability to maintain it, and rewrote it in characters of blood."

I then said, sir, that—

"The present government or supreme power of Mexico has no right to subjugate Texas. And here I am opposed by the admissions of all, who have written and spoken upon this subject, that she has such right. If she has the right, whence did she derive it? Has England a *right* to subjugate us if she can, by a war undertaken for that express purpose? No, sir; no nation has a right to commence an unjust war of aggression upon a peaceable neighbor, for the purpose of subjecting such nation to its power, for the mere purpose of conquest. It is in violation of the law of God, and of those great principles of justice he has established.

"Texas was never a party to the present established government of Mexico. She was a party to her federative system, but not to her central despotism, and owes to it no fealty. Her history, as already recited, proves this; and the conclusion is irresistible, that being in that position towards Mexico, she has a right to maintain it if she can; and a war waged to drive her from it, and subjugate her to a power she has always repudiated, would be a war commenced in wrong waged unjustly, and its authors, aiders, and abettors should receive, as they would deserve, the execrations of the world."

And, Mr. President, I entertain these opinions now; and I assert that the whole history of the relations of Texas with Mexico shows that the former was never a party to any other system of government, as a component part of the latter, than as a member of the federal republican system of 1824. She resisted successfully the sway of the usurper of 1835, which she had a perfect right to do; and so would any one of the States of this Union possess this right, under similar circumstances. I will take Maine as an instance, as that is a frontier State, and newly admitted into the Union of States on a federative system. How did she join it, and on what principles? That she was a sovereign and independent State, with a republican form of government, uniting her fortunes with other States with the same forms of government. Now, suppose, sir—but it is hardly a supposable case—that all the rest of the States of the confederacy, except Maine, should agree to abolish the federative system and their republican forms of government, and establish a monarchy, or a despotism; would they, united, have the right to coerce Maine, by force of arms, to do the same thing—to abolish her forms, and subject her to the control of a system of government radically different from the one she had joined? No, sir; no. Maine would have a perfect right to declare and maintain her independence, if she could; and a war waged to subjugate her, would be a war waged in wrong. No senator will deny this.

Well, sir, this was the position of Texas, and, as I have said, she rewrote her declaration of independence on the bank of the San Jacinto, on the 21st of April, 1836, in characters of blood; and as we point to the 4th of July, 1776, as the first year of our independence, and to the triumph at Yorktown as confirming it, so can Texas recur to the second of March, 1836, and to the victory of San Jacinto, as like memorable eras in her history. No, sir, the usurpers of 1835 never did extend their conquest east of the Rio del Norte: they crossed it for that purpose, but were invariably unsuccessful; and that river was made the line beyond which they should not come.

The independence of Texas, Mr. President, we all know, was manifested by adopting a constitution and a name, as applicable to that division of the earth's surface composing the republic of Texas. Her Congress met under this constitution, and among the acts passed by it is one of the 19th December, 1836, declaring the boundaries of the republic, as one of the independent nations of the earth, which was, upon the west, the west bank of the Rio Grande, from its mouth to its source; and this, in conformity with the treaty, pact, or agreement, made with the head of the Mexican government—the usurper Santa Anna—immediately after the battle of San Jacinto. This act of Congress was a public act, and as such must be presumed to have been in the knowledge of our government in 1837, when the independence of Texas was acknowledged, and diplomatic relations entered into with her. It gave to us, and to the world, notice of the extent of that republic—of the extent of that portion of an independent sovereignty called Texas. But it is said, sir, that one nation cannot make a boundary for itself. As a general remark, it may be sustained by facts, as coterminous nations usually establish their boundaries by treaty; but cannot a nation enlarge its boundaries, or prescribe a boundary for itself, without the consent of another coterminous nation? Suppose France, engaged in a defensive war with the neighboring powers, should carry her victorious arms to the Elbe, and, by a decree, incorporate the conquered countries within her dominion, and declare the Elbe, and not the Alps and the Rhine, her boundary, and could maintain it, would she not have a right to do so? So of Maine, sir, if she was separated from the confederacy by the revolutionary acts of her sister States, remaining an independent State, capable of forming such relations with the nations of the earth as their interests required, she protecting and sustaining herself, should she be invaded from the adjacent British provinces, and was able to drive her foe beyond the river St. John, and maintain her sovereignty and jurisdiction up to that river—declare it a part of her territory, and the leading nations of the world, who make the law of the world, should treat with her as an independent State, with that boundary—would not the right of Maine to that enlargement of territory and extension of boundary be a perfect right? If otherwise, I would ask why?

England, France, Holland, and Belgium, two of them certainly the leading powers of the world, also acknowledged the independence of Texas, with these defined limits, as a republic—as a nation of the earth, capable by its position of making war, concluding peace, and clothed with all the attributes of an independent sovereignty. I place much more stress upon these acts of recognition by the great powers of the world than others seem to do, and I must confess, sir, they have had a controlling influence on my mind in forming my opinion. They declare, in effect, that the division of the earth called the republic of Texas, with certain prescribed limits, is an independent power of the earth, and entitled to all the immunities of nations, of which the right to a boundary is one. Suppose, sir, this government, France, or England, had, after acknowledging the independence of Texas, entered into a treaty of alliance with her, offensive and defensive, would not we and they be required to defend her, up to the boundary she claimed, against an invasion from Mexico? Clearly, sir, this would be the extent of the obligation under such a treaty. If this be so, then was our duty more imperative, after we had allured her to our embrace—had prevailed on her to embark her fortunes with ours—to transfer her lone star, gleaming in solitary splendor, to our field of azure—to sink her nationality in our own—to yield her proud position as an independent nation to become a subordinate State; to defend her against all aggression with the best blood of our people, to the last cent in our treasury, and with the whole might of the nation. We were bound, most religiously bound, to defend Texas in her entirety, and it was for that purpose, and with no other view, our troops were ordered to take their position on the western limits of that State. An invasion was threatened. War had been denounced both before and after the annexation. Have senators forgotten our efforts made in the fall of 1845, and in all sincerity and good faith, to prevent this resort to arms? Did we not, before that, assure Mexico, that in what we had done by incorporating Texas into the Union, we intended no unkindness to her; that we could not but consider Texas an independent nation, and the power of Mexico over it gone forever; and did we not propose an amicable adjustment of the matter, and seek to heal the wound inflicted upon her pride? And how were these our declarations, and this our attempt at adjustment by sending a minister to them on their promise to receive him, treated by that power? We all know, sir, and it is useless to speak of them. Our minister was rejected—Mexico even refused to talk with him—refused to hear our propositions; and still persisted in her determination to repossess herself of Texas by arms; she never alleging at any time any other claim to Texas than the claim to the Sabine, and taking no exception to the position of our troops within that territory; for it will be recollected, that preparatory to receiving our minister, she only requested that our naval forces should be withdrawn from her coast, lest it might appear, if she negotiated at all, it would be considered she did so under a menace. She never desired that the army should be removed.

If, sir, the right to Texas was a doubtful one, what was the duty of Mexico under such circumstances? Certainly to hear what we had to say about it—to listen to propositions of settlement—to negotiate, if possible; for there are but two ways of settling such disputes—negotiation and arms; and as Mexico has chosen the latter, I, for one, am determined she shall feel our might; and while we have her in our power, compel her to yield up the fullest measure of indemnity for all her past transgressions and enormities, and make no accommodation with her until this is done.

Sir, in my view of the duty of nations disputing about a doubtful right, we would have been perfectly justified by declaring war against Mexico on her refusal to receive our minister; for, sir, it is incumbent on the contesting nation to negotiate, and submit to an honorable compromise. If a nation will not do this, the other party to the contest has a right to resort to arms to compel an adjustment of the question; and though war does not decide the right, yet a victory usually puts it in the power of the successful party to enforce a compliance with the demand—at least this is so understood among civilized nations.

Sir, the annexation of Texas was decided on by the people with their eyes open—in view of the threats of Mexico that she would declare war—and they were willing to have war rather than lose Texas; and the effort is vain, worse than useless, to attempt to make them believe that it is an unjust war, or a war of aggression on our part. They have too much sense for this. No, sir, they are fully convinced of its justice, and it is, therefore, popular; and no declamation can drive them from the position they have taken, to support it with zeal and energy. In view of the facts and reasons presented, no doubt can remain that the war was brought on by the act of Mexico, and so declared by an almost unanimous vote of both houses of Congress on the 13th of May, 1846, by the law of that date in response to the message of the Executive unfolding its causes, and ushered to the world in the usual mode by the proclamation of the President.

Although, practically, war had commenced on the 24th of April, 1846, by the attack of Mexico on a detachment of our troops, and again on the 8th and 9th of May, and existed on those days as perfectly as the hostile acts of a foreign power can cause it to exist—they not being predatory incursions, made without authority or without apparent cause, and with a view to plunder, but undertaken in pursuance of previous official notifications to our government, that war should follow the annexation of Texas, which Mexico regarded as a revolted province, and to which her right had not been at all invalidated by the act of annexation; yet, so far as we were concerned—so far as our relations, nationally and individually, were involved, the war had its constitutional existence on the passage of the act of the 13th of May, 1846. That act changed our relations from peace to war; recognised the practical fact, that the act of Mexico had produced it; and we gave it our sanction, and published our acknowledgment of it to the world in the usual mode. The phraseology of the act declaring it is nearly identical with that of the 18th of June, 1812, as senators may see who will examine. Both proceeded from messages of the President detailing the causes, and both were announced to the world by proclamations; and, yielding to no one in my sense of the justice of the war of 1812 with Great Britain, I am constrained to say, sir, that the justice of this loses nothing by the comparison; and as that war was denounced as "Jim Madison's war," as unjust and aggressive, so is this denounced as Mr. Polk's war, and with equal boldness its injustice proclaimed. The causes of the war of 1812 have been alluded to by the senator of Kentucky, [Mr. UNDERWOOD;] they were good causes, and such as should have prompted the nation, with one heart, to rise up and defend its rights; and as that had, so will this have, a glorious issue. But, sir, our then enemy had not invaded our territory—had murdered none of our citizens—though they had forcibly impressed them in their naval service, and flagrantly invaded our neutral rights. To bring on this war, and to add to the injury inflicted upon us by the robbery and murder of our citizens, Mexico invaded the soil of one of our sister States, threatening to subjugate it, defying alike our power and our right. Mexico commenced the war for conquest, avowedly to conquer Texas, of which she alleged she had been unjustly despoiled by us; and as she had repeatedly declared she would do, she sought by force to recover it, and the whole of it, to the Sabine. She sought conquest—sought to rob us of one of the brightest gems in our national coronet; and, though the issue could not be doubtful, yet the attempt was an indignity, adding insult to former injuries, and should have been met and repulsed, as it has been, by the power of the nation, and merited chastisement inflicted. Can senators tell me for what purpose the Mexican army was on the bank of the Rio Grande, if it was not to carry out the oft-repeated threat to recover Texas by force? It was for no other purpose; and its leader embraced the first favorable opportunity to make the invasion; and it has never been disavowed by the government. Sir, as to the justice of this war, in view of all these things, it loses nothing in comparison with that of 1812; and that war was denounced in terms equally violent and unmeasured with this. The party at that day arrayed against it when it was declared, was eager to get the nation into it years before Congress acted. Every effort was made to influence the minds of the people against Great Britain, and appeals of the most inflammatory character, accompanied by attacks upon the administration, of the want of spirit and patriotism, were constantly made; and they asserted that it was so tame and spiritless that it "could not be kicked into a war." As early as 1806, a leading federal print of that day declared that "the disputes between this country and England, so long attended with rigor on her part, and injury on ours, will not admit of much longer vain complaints and harsh recriminations. They must terminate shortly in the silence of war or peace." And again, in the same year, it declared "they [the democrats in Congress] dare not resist all aggressions alike, and assume the part of spirited impartiality, as a magnanimous policy requires. If war is called for by the insulted honor of the country; if the cup of conciliation is drained to the dregs, as they declare it to be, let the war be declared; let an embargo be laid; adequate funds provided; the strong arm of defence nerved and extended; and a powerful navy ordered. In these measures the whole country, from Georgia to Maine, convinced of their propriety, will be united."

These extracts are from the Boston Centinel, then the leading federal paper of the Union.

A letter from Washington, of the same year, says: "Fear, prejudice, or some other dastardly principle, is continually crossing the path of our rulers; and the loud call of our country, its commerce and spoiled merchants, for energetic purposes, is unheard or disregarded. My fears are, that the President's messages will only be supported by windy debates, or pen and ink reports."

Although the "Centinel" had proposed an embargo, yet when it was laid in 1807, it said: "The embargo, which the government has just laid, is of a new and alarming nature. War, great as the evil is, has less terror, and will produce less misery, than an embargo on such principles."

When—forbearance ceasing to be a virtue—war was declared, the Senate of Massachusetts resolved that "it was founded in falsehood, declared without necessity, and its real object was extent of territory by unjust conquests, and to aid the late tyrant of Europe in his view of aggrandizement."

And the pulpit, where politics should not enter, became also a theatre in which its ministers sought to inflame the public mind against the administration of their country, and place it in the wrong, in the sight of their powerful enemy and the world.

One of them, highly distinguished by his position as the Rector of the Trinity church in Boston, in a discourse delivered in July, 1812, said: "This is a war unexampled in the history of the world, wantonly proclaimed on the most frivolous and groundless pretences against a nation from whose friendship we might derive the most signal advantages, and from whose hostility we have reason to dread the most tremendous losses." Again: "Every provocation has been offered to Great Britain on our part, and our resentment has risen in proportion as she has shown a conciliatory spirit."

And then, in his pious fervor, he exhorts his hearers thus: "Let no consideration whatever, my brethren, deter you, at all times and in all places, from execrating the present war. It is a war unjust, foolish, and ruinous." And, "as Mr. Madison has declared the war, let Mr. Madison carry it on."

And, not to be outdone in the hostility here exhibited, another eminent divine, at Medford, the Rev. Dr. Osgood, endeavored to prevent his countrymen from enlisting in the service, and from loaning money to the government, to carry on the war. Here is what he says:

"If, at the command of a weak or wicked ruler, they undertake an unjust war, each man who volunteers his services in the cause, or loans his money for its support, or by his conversation, his writings, or any other mode of influence, encourages its promotion, that man is an accomplice in the wickedness, loads his conscience with the blackest crimes, brings the guilt of blood upon his soul, and in the sight of God and his law, is a MURDERER."

Another one, a reverend doctor also, gave his hearers, if there were any that justified the war, this consolation: "Let every man who sanctions this war by his suffrage or influence, remember that he is laboring to cover himself and his country with blood. The blood of the slain will cry from the ground against him." "And," he asks, "how will the supporters of this anti-Christian warfare endure their sentence; endure their own reflections; endure the fire that forever burns—the worm which never dies—the hosannas of Heaven—while the smoke of their torments ascends forever and ever?"

The press too, sir—that mighty engine, operating with such wonderful power on the public mind—in the very midst of the war, when loans were necessary to carry it on, and our honor and our all at issue, was engaged in most unholy and unpatriotic efforts to embarrass the government by attempting to deter capitalists from loaning their money; and I fear, sir, similar attempts may be made now, but I hope not.

Here are two extracts from the leading federal and anti-war papers of that day:

"Will federalists subscribe to the loan? Will they lend money to our national rulers? It is impossible." "What, then, if we now lend them money? They will not make peace; they will still hanker for Canada; they will assemble forces, and shed blood on our western frontier: mere pride, if nothing else, would make them do it. The motives which first brought on the war, will still continue it if the money can be had." "Any federalist who lends money to government, must go and shake hands with James Madison, and claim fellowship with Felix Grundy. Let him no more call himself a federalist and friend to his country! He will be called by others infamous!"

"Our merchants constitute an honorable, high-minded, independent, and intelligent class of citizens. They feel the oppression, injury, and mockery with which they are treated by this government. They will lend their money to retrace their steps; but none to persevere in their present course. *Let every highwayman find his own pistols.*"

The New York Evening Post, then a paper of the same stamp, federal and anti-war, said:

"We have only room this evening to say that we trust no true friend to his country will be found among the subscribers to the Gallatin loan."

And the Boston Gazette said:

"It is very grateful to find that the universal sentiment is, that *any man who lends his money to the government at the present time, will forfeit all claim to common honesty and common courtesy among all true friends to the country.*"

And, sir, to such an extent were their efforts carried, that the agents of the government appointed to receive subscriptions for the loan, found it necessary to advertise that the names of the subscribers should be known only to themselves.

But, sir, this conduct, so unjustifiable as it was, hardly equals that of the present day, as we may see by reference to some of the leading opposition journals in different parts of the United States, to say nothing of their great organ here at Washington. I have in my hand, sir, some extracts from these papers, and will read them, regretting at the same time the necessity that exists for doing so.

Here are extracts from leading opposition prints in Ohio:

"The voice of lamentation and war, heard all over the country, from homes and firesides made desolate by the slaughter of fathers, and husbands, and brothers, is sweet music to the ears of the President and his friends, *and they seem ambitious to swell the chorus by increasing the number of victims.*"—*Warren Chronicle.*

"THEY (the Mexicans) ARE IN THE RIGHT—WE IN THE WRONG. THEY may appeal in confidence to the God of Battles; but if we look for aid to any other than human power, it must be to the INFERNAL MACHINATIONS OF HELL, for thus far, it would seem, the DEVIL HAS GOVERNED AND GUIDED ALL OUR ACTIONS in the premises."—*Xenia Torch Light.*

"We rejoice to see a large and respectable number of the whig papers in this and other States taking decided ground against further appropriations by Congress of men and money for the Mexican throat-cutting business. This is as it should be."—*Ibid.*

"If Congress is opposed to the war—if that body is of opinion that it is unjust, impolitic, and of dangerous tendency, NO DUTY CAN BE MORE BINDING THAN THAT OF REFUSING THE MEANS TO PROSECUTE IT. The war is the result of usurpation, begun originally without consulting the war-making power."

[*Lebanon (O.) Star.*

"No man, no people, looking upon the contest, CAN HELP SYMPATHIZING WITH MEXICO, and uniting in UTTERING A BITTER CONDEMNATION AGAINST OUR OWN GOVERNMENT."—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

"A war against a neighboring republic, waged now *avowedly for the acquisition of territory*, under the *fraudulent pretext of seeking indemnity* for alleged claims for injuries to the persons and property of our citizens."

[*Cin. Atlas.*

Here are some extracts from other papers of the same stamp in different parts of the United States:

"None of the aggressors in Europe or Asia ever resorted to justificatory reasons which were so false and hypocritical as those alleged for our aggressions on Mexico." "The truth is, it (the war) was conceived in folly and wickedness, and commenced by a gross usurpation on the part of the President."—*Kennebec (Me.) Journal.*

"Let every one keep aloof from this *unrighteous*, INFAMOUS, GOD ABHORRED war, and it will soon come to an end. The prospect is, that the administration can get neither men nor money to carry on the war! *Thank the Lord for all that!*"—*N. H. Statesman.*

"*To volunteer or vote a dollar to carry on the war is moral treason against the God of Heaven and the rights of mankind.*"—*Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette.*

"*Talk of this war as we may, shout, rejoice, and illuminate your cities, it is still a war of injustice, of conquest, and of unmitigated evil;* and it is high time that the virtuous and patriotic should speak out in condemnation of it."—*Boston Sentinel.*

And on another occasion, speaking of Mr. Trist's negotiation:

"It shows very clearly what the original object and purposes of the war were; that is, in a word, that the great object was ACQUISITION OF NEW TERRITORY."

"The Mexican war appears to be fast settling down to a mere matter of PLUNDER and MURDER. * * *

"*We think the war* DISREPUTABLE TO THE AGE WE LIVE IN, *and the country of which it is our boast to be called her children.*"—*Boston Atlas.*

"If there is in the United States a heart worthy of American liberty, its *impulse* is TO JOIN THE MEXICANS, and to hurl down upon the *base, slavish, mercenary invaders* who, born in a republic, go to play over the accursed game of the Hessians on the tops of those Mexican volcanoes. *It would be a sad and woful joy nevertheless to hear that the hordes under Scott and Taylor were* EVERY MAN OF THEM SWEPT INTO THE NEXT WORLD! *What business has an invading army in this?*"—*Boston Daily Chronotype.*

Here are the sentiments of some of them in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Kentucky, and Tennessee—all leading opposition papers; and I regret to say, sir, the last two from my own most patriotic State:

"THE WHOLE WORLD KNOWS THAT IT IS MEXICO WHICH HAS BEEN IMPOSED UPON, and that OUR PEOPLE ARE THE ROBBERS!!" "So far as our government can effect it, the laws of Heaven are SUSPENDED, and those of hell established in their stead." "To the people of the United States! Your rulers are precipitating you into a fathomless abyss of *crime and calumny!*"—*New York Tribune.*

"But the whig party are unchanged in their view of this contest, (with Mexico.) *Its origin was the annexation—its immediate cause, the unauthorized occupation of disputed territory. It is the President's war!*" "Mexico is the Poland of America." "If there were excuse for the war, there is none for the measure which opened it. But what excuse is found for the war itself?"—*North American.*

"We may suppose that we are to carry on a war for conquest, and that the halls of the Montezumas are to be occupied by THE INVADERS from the United States!" "Mexico has done infinitely more for herself in this war than the United States, by their government, have done for themselves."—*U. S. Gazette.*

"What is it, then, that makes or allows Mr. Polk to sanction this war, and all the outrages of which it is the consequence? It is this: *Mr. Polk is a weak man.* He was selected to be the locofoco candidate for President because he was weak. It was this that recommended him to his party. It was this that elected him. It has been correctly said, that it is a curse upon a nation to have a weak-minded ruler. We are under the judgment of that curse."—*Baltimore Patriot.*

"If there is any conduct which constitutes moral treason, *it is an attempt to embark or to encourage the country in* A WAR AGAINST GOD, *as is the case in a war like that in which we are now engaged.*"—*Louisville Journal.*

"TO VOLUNTEER, OR VOTE A DOLLAR TO CARRY ON THE WAR, IS MORAL TREASON AGAINST THE GOD OF HEAVEN, and the RIGHTS OF MANKIND!"—*Nashville Gazette.*

"The fact is, the Mexican war was begun in a perfidious, rascally attempt of demagogues at president-making; and is now being carried out in the same spirit and under the auspices of men, who, to gain the spoils, have RESORTED TO THIS INIQUITOUS SCHEME OF CONQUEST."—*Chicago Journal.*

"We cannot possibly look favorably upon this war; its first act was A GROSS OUTRAGE UPON MEXICO. And can it be supposed by Mr. Polk, and his advisers, that an error so glaring—A CRIME SO UNPARDONABLE AS THIS MEXICAN WAR—can be whitewashed? We may well wish our country out of this UNRIGHTEOUS WAR."—*Mount Carmel Register.*

I have not alluded, Mr. President, to the events of the last war—all which come to me as history, for I cannot say "*quorum pars fui*"—for the purpose of awakening old resentments and buried animosities, nor with any unkind spirit to any of the actors in them, nor indeed with any personal allusion whatever; but I have thought it might be useful to the country to exhibit the perfect resemblance between the spirit of the opposition of that day and of this; and as we know that not one of the misguided political fanatics of that time, however distinguished he might have been for his talents and his virtues, has been able to stand before the people of this nation and claim and receive their confidence, their condemnation has been so overwhelming; so we may expect that those of this day, going as they do even beyond these their great prototypes, will as surely meet with a punishment equally withering and condign. Sir, there can be no mistake about this—no one of them can escape the blighting judgment of an offended and outraged people. As willing as we all are and should be, "to pardon something to the spirit of liberty," and to indulge in the freest discussion, yet, sir, when political fanaticism goes so far as we see it now, it is much to be apprehended the judgment of posterity will distinguish it by another appellation. Their fate should be a warning to those who may be disposed to withhold supplies of men and money now; they should listen to the teachings of the past, learning wisdom from its experience. It is in vain to say, sir, that the war is unjust or unconstitutionally commenced, against all the facts to the contrary, and thus attempt to escape responsibility; they will be held to it, sir, and cannot shield themselves by any such pretence.

Mr. BADGER. Will the honorable senator allow me, as he has several times alluded to some one who characterized this war as an unconstitutional war, to ask him if he referred to me?

Mr. BREESE. I referred to the senator of Kentucky immediately before you, [Mr. UNDERWOOD.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I beg to inform the honorable senator that my remark was, that it was an unconstitutional act by which the war was commenced—the placing our troops on the Rio Grande.

Mr. BREESE. I have shown, sir, I think, that was a proper act—one which he had a right to do. Suppose our government had taken no precautionary measures for the defence of Texas against the threatened invasion of Mexico, having, as she had, a large force on and near that frontier, and breathing war in every missile from her functionaries, would the President have discharged his duty to Texas? Would our obligations to her have been fulfilled? If one solitary inmate of the humblest cabin within it had been the victim of a Mexican inroad, and his little all given to the flames, or carried off as booty, and we not there with our protecting power, how loud, and deep, and bitter would have been the denunciations of those who now assail the Executive for this act intended alone for protection—alone to prevent invasion. Sir, we were placed in such a situation as to compel the government, by all its obligations of justice, honor, and good faith, to take the position we did; and such, sir, is the honest judgment of the country.

Well, sir, we are now in this war, our armies have gone "deep into the bowels of the land," and it seems to me alike the dictate of duty and patriotism to prosecute it with renewed vigor, and never conclude a peace until we have accomplished what is now, and has always been our object, reparation for the past and security for the future, no matter to what results the attempt may lead.

All of us, I believe, sir, were willing, in 1846, and expected, that the war would be carried into the heart of Mexico. I recollect well, sir, a remark of the distinguished senator of North Carolina, [Mr. MANGUM,] who has not spoken to this bill, that if he could be satisfied that the war did exist—if there should be no disavowal on the part of the Mexican government of the act of crossing the Rio Grande and attacking our troops, he would vote not only ten thousand, but fifty, or a hundred thousand men; and, if necessary, proceed to the plaza of the city of Mexico, and there dictate a peace. I believe it was well understood then, sir—at least such is the inference I draw from the remarks of that honorable senator—that crossing the Rio Grande by Mexican troops would be an invasion of our territory, and that we must not only repel it, but carry the war, with sufficient array, into the enemy's country, and this senator expressed a most cheerful willingness to give the government all the means, both of men and money, requisite for such a prosecution of the war; and, at the last session, the same patriotic spirit was manifested, for the supplies were then granted with very little opposition—only three, I believe, voting against the bill to raise an additional military force, and but two against the loan bill. And why senators should now refuse to support a measure like this, to reinforce the army, I am at a loss to conceive; nor can I reconcile it with the vote they have already given on an amendment proposed to it.

Mr. MANGUM. The honorable senator refers to certain remarks which I am reported to have made, introductory to my vote upon the bill recognising the existence of the war, and certainly an erroneous inference has been drawn from those remarks, or else I did not understand myself. The question was raised, whether we should cross the Rio Grande for the purpose of chastising our enemy. Well, I never doubted, that in the case of aggression on their part, it was entirely proper for us to pursue them even to the heart of their country; but an inference is not to be drawn from this, that I contemplated anything like conquest. This I have been utterly opposed to, as my recorded votes will show. At the time when we were called upon to recognise the existence of the war, we had heard of a collision having taken place, but we knew not how it originated; the documents were not before us to be read, and we were driven to a vote at once, and were obliged to vote in the dark; but on that occasion I did not doubt that we had a right to cross the Rio Grande, in order to chastise an aggression. That was my meaning; and if my remarks are correctly reported, they meant that, and no more than that, and therefore I repel the inference that I was desirous or willing to go into a career of conquest.

Mr. BREESE. I will read, sir, an extract from the remarks of the honorable senator, as reported in the Congressional Globe:

"He and his friends are ready to grant whatever men and money were required in half an hour. And before the men raised could arrive at their destination, the requisite time would have been afforded to determine intelligently, and on authentic evidence, whether a state of war did or did not exist. If it did, then Mr. M. should be unwilling to restrain the action of our forces to the left bank of the Rio del Norte. If we were actually at war, then he was under the impression that our forces ought to cross the river, and that we should not stop till we had dictated peace at the capital of the Mexican empire. Let the fact be clearly ascertained, and then he was prepared to vote not fifty thousand men only, but a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand, if the Executive came to Congress and demanded that amount. He was ready to place the whole force of the country at his disposal, and that he should be enabled to conquer peace in the heart of the Mexican empire."

The senator does not deny that he is correctly reported, and I could not, of course, know what particular views the honorable senator then entertained, any further than I can gather them from these remarks. But what are we to conclude was to be done by such a force as he was willing to vote, unless it was to overrun Mexico and conquer it, and in that way "conquer peace?"

Mr. MANGUM. I meant any