BY ROBERT ARMSTRONG.

TERMS:

DAILY, per year, - - - - - $10 00
SEMI-WEEKLY, (published tri-weekly during the session of Congress) - - - - - 5 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 III. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 243.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRIDAY MORNING, JANUARY 27, 1854.

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 the 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.

☞ 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.

CONGRESSIONAL.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

SENATE.

JANUARY 16, 1854.

[IN CONTINUATION.]

The Senate having under consideration the motion submitted by Mr. CASS on Thursday, the 5th instant, to refer to the Committee on Foreign Relations the message of the President of the United States received on the 3d instant, communicating, in compliance with the resolution of the Senate of December 12, 1853, the correspondence which had taken place with the British government on subjects growing out of the treaty of Washington of July 4, 1850, since the message of the President of December 30, 1852—

Mr. CLAYTON resumed and concluded his speech, as published some days ago.

Mr. CASS. Mr. President, there are a few things which I desire to say at this time; but I have not the least idea of detaining the Senate with any examination of the argument of the senator from Delaware. I shall not take long; and I wish to dismiss the subject entirely from my mind, and therefore I prefer to proceed now.

The honorable senator commenced this discussion by saying that the latter part of my speech was contradictory of the former; and he related an incident, it may be, or, perhaps, a parable, of a boy who was whipped by his master because when he stood up he was too tall, and when he sat down he was too short; and the senator then alluded, I thought rather contemptuously than complimentary, to my position as a schoolmaster in his own State at a former period.

Mr. CLAYTON. Not at all. No man has a greater veneration for the character of the schoolmaster than I have.

Mr. CASS. Nor I. I think if there is one occupation in our whole country which demands, and should receive, the kind consideration of its citizens, it is that of the teacher to whom is committed the task of forming the mind and character, the intellect and heart, of the American youth, to fit and prepare them for the private and public duties before them, and especially, and above all, to fit them to become the depositaries of the precious institutions which have come down to us from the wisdom and exertions of our fathers, and which they ought to be able to transmit as unimpaired to their posterity as they receive them.

There can be no more honorable employment, in the just acceptation of the term; and I will tell the senator that I was a schoolmaster, and I am proud of it. I glory in it. I glory in being the citizen of a country where the avenues of distinction are equally open to all, the highest and lowest, without any difference; where the poor schoolmaster may look forward, and, by proper conduct and the favor of his fellow-citizens, may be advanced to the highest position in the country. Why, it is a most glorious illustration of our institutions. It is a flag waving in the heavens, and thrown out to the nations of the earth, inviting them to do as we have done, and to assert their equal rights as we are doing.

Yes, Mr. President, I was a poor schoolmaster. I began life under disadvantageous circumstances; and now my heart is filled with gratitude to my country, that from that situation I have been advanced with no merit of my own, but by the favor of my fellow-citizens, from post to post, until I find myself here in this great depository of the power of the American people—in my opinion the highest deliberate body in the world—and made the associate of the most eminent men of our country who enjoy the confidence of their fellow-citizens, and who have been sent here to represent the sovereign States of the Union.

Well, sir, the senator from Delaware said that my speech was contradictory. It was; there is no doubt about it, if by that is meant it presented different views of the subject; and I think I can explain in a few words the reason for it, to the satisfaction of the senator. The first part of my speech was a home speech; it was an examination into the conduct of our government in relation to the treaty which has been discussed. There the honorable senator was a very prominent object; he was tall, of course, and he stood out in bold relief on the picture, because of his official position as Secretary of State, and negotiator of the treaty. I do not impeach his motives. I have the greatest kindness for him; but I say he stood prominently forward in the picture for that reason.

My object was to show what was my opinion, and what it is to this day, of the rider which was put upon the treaty, and to show that the President had no right to put it there. It was and is my opinion, too, that there are loose expressions in the treaty which have led to much difficulty, and that it would have been far better if the protectorate had been abandoned, instead of being retained. I placed these matters prominently forward, as I had a right to do, as a subject of home, internal administration. I wanted to redeem myself from the charge of having believed that any part of Central America was not included in the treaty. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. WALKER] has placed me on unassailable ground on that point. He referred, at the last session, to the remarks I made in the Senate at the time the treaty was under discussion, fully explaining my course in regard to this point. My object, therefore, was to place myself in a proper position, and not to leave any ground for the supposition that I understood the treaty as excluding any part of Central America. Upon that part of the subject it was proper that I should enter into all these home questions; and I repeat, the honorable senator from Delaware necessarily occupied a very high position, and, to use the illustration of his apologue, he was a tall boy when standing up, meriting reproof for that very position.

After I got through with that topic, what had I then to do? I had quite a different task to perform—to maintain the honor and interest of this country in its intercourse with a foreign nation—which foreign nation said it would not carry the treaty into effect. What then was I to do? To take the treaty and make the best of it, as I did, and say that, notwithstanding there were objections to it, I believe that, if fairly carried out, it will remove British power and influence from Central America, which was the great object I had in view. The senator from Delaware himself says, very correctly, that if the treaty be carried out, it will disarm the protectorate of the obnoxious features attending it, and likewise restrict Great Britain certainly, and beyond all question, to her old position at the Belize. I said, therefore, that under these circumstances, our honor and our position before the world required us to say to Great Britain, You shall not get rid of the treaty; you shall not be allowed to come forward, in the face of the world, and say to the United States, "If you do not make another treaty we shall violate the old one, and hold on to the country." I was opposed to that course, because I thought it inconsistent with the honor and interest of my country. Hence, though I thought there were grave errors in the matter, I was anxious to maintain the treaty before the world. I think there is not an honorable member here who will not appreciate this. In this part of my speech, to use the honorable senator's apologue, he was sitting down; he became small. All men are small compared to such a subject. The positions were changed, and he was the short boy.

Now, I will say to the honorable senator that I think he understands me; and I am sure that if I were in Delaware teaching school, and the honorable senator were my pupil, I could make him understand it, [laughter,] and at any rate, with a little of that wholesome discipline recommended by the wise man of Israel, by which striking arguments *a posteriori* mount to the brain, and there produce instruction and conviction.

Mr. President, the honorable senator said in his speech that I began wrong. Sir, the senator from Delaware is an able tactician. He is far beyond that. He is a powerful debater, as the experience we had upon this occasion, as well as upon many a previous one, sufficiently proves. I say in perfect sincerity that he is a very able debater, and withal a parliamentary tactician. It is a power which comes by experience. It is not the gift of Nature. Like a tried general, he conceals his weak point and makes a furious onslaught on his opponent in another direction.

The honorable senator said that I began in error. What was that error? Why, according to him, the error was in maintaining the position that the British possessions in Belize were in Central America.

In the first place, allow me to observe that the honorable senator introduced a map here the other day, and I am satisfied he did it by way of throwing a slur on mapmakers generally, as he expressed himself in March in relation to this very map, as I think it was. I venture to say that from the senator's remarks it would be supposed, considered, and perhaps it was the senator's own impression, that the map actually intended to designate Texas as part of Central America. Why, look on the inscription of the map and see what it says, and the honorable senator will at once see that it is not an authority depended upon for the purpose for which he quoted it. Here is the title of the map: "Map of Central America, including the States of Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the territories of Belize and Mosquito, with parts of Mexico, Yucatan, and New Granada, showing the proposed line between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by way of Tehuantepec." The map is in the Secretary's office, where the senator can refer to it. It is very clear that the compiler of that map never dreamt of confining it to Central America, but that he was extending it elsewhere.

I shall not go over the question in regard to Central America, but there are a few circumstances in reference to it to which I wish to call the attention of the honorable senator, who has maintained, certainly with a great deal of ability, that the British possessions at the Belize are not in Central America.

The term Central America, as I view it, can be nothing but a geographical one, and I will state the reason why. The honorable senator says the term is a political one, for the reason, as I understood him, that we made treaties with Central America, and that the use of the phrase is to be limited to the States with which we made those treaties. It is true we did make treaties with the States of Central America, but those States have passed away. There is now no such political region known in the world as political Central America, any more than the Saxon Heptarchy, or political Italy, or political Hungary, or political Poland. These countries have no political existence. The term is a geographical one, and, as I contend, can be nothing else. The States of Central America existed about twenty years. Now, suppose those treaties had been made before they existed, what region would the phrase "Central America" have designated but a geographical one? And now they have passed away, what does it mean but the same thing?

If the honorable senator had enumerated in the treaty which he made all the States of Central America, the whole difficulty would have been obviated; but, as I said before, some of them are enumerated and some are left out. The treaty expressly mentions Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito country, and the rest of Central America, leaving out the States of San Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala; and it is on the northern frontiers of Guatemala where the precise difficulty arises as to the limits of Central America. I cannot for my life see any reason why the negotiators did not go on and enumerate the States which did compose Central America, instead of enumerating only a part, and then adding "the rest of Central America."

Another thing will be observed. When we come actually to the authoritative expression which should be used in such a solemn act, we find that there never was such a republic as the republic of Central America. Our treaty with them is with the federation of the centre of America. You will find that is the descriptive epithet in the treaty. It is so on our statute-book. I am not a Spanish scholar, and I do not know whether the words are correctly translated; but on our statute-book the parties to the treaty appear to be the United States of America and "the federation of the centre of America." But suppose it to be the confederation of Central America, as it is popularly termed, it no more follows that they included the whole of Central America than that our own United States include the whole of America. The fact was to be determined according to the time and circumstances in which they were applied. It was Central America geographically, and nothing else, for ages, and politically for about twenty years; but the political condition disappeared, and it is now only geographical Central America, and can be nothing else. Why the senator did not remove all this difficulty and uncertainty by a simple, unequivocal description of the country, I should be glad to have him explain.

The honorable senator from Delaware is, as I have said, an able tactician, and he has proved it in this case by the manœuvre of keeping out of sight his own exposed point, and pushing his column in another direction upon his opponent. I had foreseen that, because the honorable senator did the same thing last spring. He confined his remarks to a part of the British claim—their claim to the Belize. I agree that there may be a reasonable doubt whether that portion of the country is in Central America; but the fact is, that the British have got more than one hundred miles south of it, to the Sarstoon river. The senator will not pretend to say here, or anywhere else, that the Sarstoon river is not in Central America. Nobody can deny it. Nobody will say that the terms of the treaty gave to England the settlement of Honduras, as she claims and holds it, the whole country to the Sarstoon river, which, as I said the other day, is just as much in the State of Guatemala as James river is in Virginia. There is no map-maker, no statesman, no politician, that ever carried the province of British Honduras so far as the Sarstoon. Not one can be found; and here are nearly one hundred and fifty miles along the coast possessed as a part of her Honduras settlement, and which the senator does not even pretend is not in Central America.

The honorable senator does not meet the whole point in his argument. He only maintains that the Belize settlement, referred to by Malte Brun and Humboldt, and other eminent men, as the British Honduras of their day, and which came down to the Siboon river, some ten or twelve miles south of the Belize, is excluded from the treaty; and, notwithstanding what the honorable senator says, I think the British have got the islands in that neighborhood, under the name of dependencies of the Belize. I repeat, I have no idea that they can hold them. They must have a title to justify them in holding, and that title must be a just one. And the admission of the negotiators, if you may so call it, does not conclude us at all as to this point. The only practical ill effect it has is, that it puts us in a worse position. If the treaty had been left as it was ratified, to include all Central America, without the rider attached to it, we could have said to England, your possessions are in Central America, and they cannot be continued. They are plainly excluded by the terms of the treaty; but as it is, we have to contest her title with her in possession. I think we may do both successfully; but I do not shut my eyes to the fact that the difficulty is increased by that declaration to which I have referred. That is all that I said on this point, and therefore I repeat, with all respect to the honorable senator, that I think the treaty can be fairly maintained by the United States to exclude everything but what he says is a portion of acinal Honduras. That is a portion of the argument which I shall not touch, but I desire the senator to observe that the more he restricts Central America, the more are we injured by the restriction.

The honorable senator has read a letter from Mr. Crampton, the British minister. I have not a word to say of Mr. Crampton but what is respectful. He is a gentleman who has been sent here to represent the interests of his country, and I dare say he does so faithfully; but I think this was a very odd kind of letter from him to be read here in this body as authority. I did not understand him to go as far as the honorable senator did in his letter; but certainly it is rather curious that the diplomatic representative of a foreign country near this government should come forward and write a letter to be read in the American Senate, and thus place it before the American people, doubting or contradicting the solemn assertions of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of his own country, founded on the advice of the law-adviser of the Crown in foreign matters, and no doubt submitted to the British cabinet, and sent here by them, and communicated to our government as their rule of action. The minister here, notwithstanding these facts, says in effect, according to the construction of the honorable senator, "My government does not understand the matter. The Secretary for Foreign Affairs is a young man, and does not comprehend his business." All I have to say, sir, is, that this is a curious proceeding, and it is no part of my business to account for it.

Mr. Crampton in his letter intimates that the islands of Roatan, Bonacca, Utilis, Helena, Barbarat, and Moat, recently constituted the colony of the Bay islands, are not claimed as dependencies of Belize. The senator from Delaware thinks that construction is fortified by one fact, which he mentions, viz: that in the British order, or, if I may use the term, in their hierarchy of possessions, a colony cannot be a dependency of a settlement. I do not know how that is, but the question does not arise here, for this simple reason: The treaty was concluded in July, 1850, and the colony was not created till 1852, so that between 1850 and 1852 these islands may have remained a portion of the dependencies of British Honduras without violating any hierarchical principle as to British settlements, colonies, and plantations, and whatever other names they may choose to use. The British minister says that they do not hold Roatan and the other Bay islands as a dependency of Belize. I may as well say here that Roatan is much the most important of all these islands. It is the most important naval station, commanding the whole of the great Bay of Honduras. It is almost a jewel in the British possessions; and I here prophesy this day that England will never willingly give it up. It is too important to her interests for her to do so; and her determination to hold it has increased from day to day since we fired the first gun in Mexico. The British minister says that they do not hold these islands as dependencies. Now, sir, so long as we know anything about them, they have been managed from Belize, and as dependencies.

In 1804 Colonel Henderson, the British commandant at Belize, made an inspection of them, and reported, in so many words, that these islands belonged to Spain. In 1830 the superintendent of Belize, with a military force, took possession of Roatan. This was when the Central American governments were united and energetic. They made a firm remonstrance to Great Britain against this act, and the troops were withdrawn and the island abandoned. In 1841 Colonel McDonald, superintendent of Belize, with another military force, took possession of Roatan, drove out the Honduras garrison, and ever since that time it has been managed, more or less, directly or indirectly, from Belize. In 1850 Colonel Woodhouse, superintendent of Belize, went there and made an arrangement in reference to them, and in 1851 the authority of Belize was extended there. Then, in 1852, we have the act of the home government establishing the colony at the Bay islands.

The pretext that the British do not hold these islands as dependencies of Belize reminds me of a circumstance which happened when I was in France. When I went there, I of course read the French constitution, in order to make myself familiar with the constitution of that country. I found that the charter provided, in so many words, that the conscription should be abolished, and that the army should be filled by recruiting. I thought that a step gained towards freedom, for I knew what an engine of oppression the power of conscription had been. But I looked around and saw that the practice of conscription was going on every day; and I asked myself, what is the meaning of all this? I inquired of General Bernard, then Minister of War, but who had formerly been in this country, what this meant. I said to him, I see you have abolished conscription by charter, but I see it is in operation every day. For I had attended a number of the places of drawing the conscription, to ascertain its operation, and I had seen exhibited the most terrible signs of distress that I ever met with. "It is true, said he, the conscription is abolished; but we now call it recruiting." So in this case: these are not dependencies, they are islands. They have ceased to be dependencies, and have become islands. The British have obtained possession of them, and hold them under no title at all. But, however the question affects our honor or our interests by the retention of these valuable possessions, we have the comfort of knowing that Great Britain holds them as islands, and not as dependencies.

The honorable senator likewise referred to Mr. Crampton in connexion with the action of our government. If I understand the letter of Mr. Crampton with respect to the phrase "Central America," he disavowed the construction put upon it by his own government. I will not repeat what I have already said about this undiplomatic proceeding; but certainly this portion of the note rather increases than diminishes its strangeness. It seems to me to be a very curious channel of communication for us to get the views of the American government through a foreign minister. The honorable senator then, as I understood, still further blamed my patriotism for not receiving the construction of the American government on this subject, as given by Mr. Crampton. I judge for myself on these matters, and so does the honorable senator; and I am sure there is no government, either British or American, which will influence my opinion on this matter at all. But I do not understand the charge of a want of patriotism in contending for the greatest extent of Central America; for the further it is carried, the further is the extent of country from which British influence is to be excluded. It is the true American side of the question, as I have already shown.

I did not quote the opinion of the British government as authority in this case. Not at all. The use which I made of it was in this connexion: The honorable senator said, in effect, that no sane man could believe that the settlement of British Honduras was in Central America. In answer to that I quoted the solemn authoritative declaration of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs that they were in Central America. I sheltered myself from the charge of insanity behind him. I did not quote his despatch as influencing my judgment at all. That was founded on my own views of the right of the case, and of the interest of my country. It is time enough for us to know the views of the American government when they are communicated to us by the Executive.

But, sir, as I have already said, the senator is an able tactician, and though I had foreseen his course, in consequence of his pursuing the same one last spring, and had met and provided for it in my first remarks, yet the senator has not touched the main point at all. I will read a paragraph or two from what I then said, and I am sure that the senator will not say here to the Senate that far the largest portion of these possessions is not in the State of Guatemala, and of course in Central America; nor that the Sarstoon is not as much in that State as James river is in Virginia. This is what I call concealing his weak point, and making an attack in another direction. What becomes of the one hundred and fifty miles between the Sarstoon and the Siboon, the southern boundary of the old Belize claim? This is in Central America, and the senator has not denied it:

"And allow me to remark, that in his historical and geographical investigations into the extent of Central America, and into the question whether the British Honduras makes part of it, the senator from Delaware has avoided a very prominent and marked circumstance in all these transactions. Great Britain is in possession of, and claims regions, which no geographer, no statesman, no man, ever denied were Central America. His argument touches merely the small district of Belize, the use of which was granted, as we have seen, by Spain to England for certain purposes, and which finally extended to the Siboon, a few miles from the Belize. Not one word can be found in any arrangement between Spain and England, nor in any claim actually set up by the latter, justifying her possession of any territory south of that river. And it is to this narrow district, and nothing more, that the respectable authorities quoted by the senator refer when they speak of the Belize settlement making part of Yucatan."

The honorable senator repeated to-day what he said the other day, that there was no effect in the joint declaration of himself and the British minister restraining the engagements of the treaty of 1850, and declaring that it does not extend to British Honduras. Now, allow me to ask the honorable senator, as an able man, and as one who is as ready as he is able, to tell me why they put it there, if it was to have no kind of effect? I want to know what all that ceremony was about? Why it was necessary to inquire of Colonel King his understanding, and that of the Senate, if there was not to be the least effect given to the declaration? How came the honorable senator to say to Colonel King, in his note, that the good faith and honor of this country required that he should make the declaration, if the declaration, when made, was to have no effect? What was the use of that proceeding, if it was to be a mere piece of idle, waste paper, and to have no effect upon the operation of the treaty? I do not talk of the legal effect of such a paper between individuals. I leave that to be determined by the courts; but I speak of the effect as between two great nations. When one says to the other, I deliver you my ratification on such a condition, and the other party thus accepts it, would not any nation in Christendom, under such circumstances, say that the act of the head of the nation would be binding in good faith, and that the ratification was conditional merely? Would it not be said, in such a case, that we were responsible before the world for the acts of the head of our government; and even as a matter of internal administration, if it should not be within his authority to make such a supplementary declaration, yet the common voice of mankind would declare that we must either accept and observe the conditional ratification or give up the treaty?

I meant to have touched upon a few other things, but I will not detain the Senate at this time. I wish merely to repeat now what I have said before, that I have not the slightest unkind feeling towards the senator from Delaware. It may be that I have used some harsh expressions, and if so, I regret it. The honorable senator has asked me this morning why I did not bring this matter forward at an earlier period. I have only to say to him, that he knows as well as I do that for two years we are all occupied with a thousand things here which demand our attention; that for two years this subject lay dead, and it was brought to our attention finally by the proclamation of Great Britain, establishing the colony of the Bay Islands. Immediately after receiving the intelligence of that proclamation, I introduced a resolution of inquiry, which led to the debate that took place at the last session of Congress.

The honorable senator has again repeated that there was no doubt as to the understanding of the Senate in reference to the treaty. If the honorable senator means by the understanding of the Senate the understanding of the majority, or of two-thirds, or of seven-eighths, if you please, I shall not contest the matter with him. All I have to say is, that a portion of the Senate, and, as I believe, a considerable portion, and myself among the number, understood it as I have stated. We have the evidence of the declarations of senators themselves that this is so, and I believe some of those around me stated at the time that such were their views.

Mr. CLAYTON. The honorable senator tells us that he was, as I said, once a school-master in the State of Delaware, and thinks that if he were there again he could convince me and all others there, by arguments *a posteriori*, of the truth of his positions. No doubt, sir, a teacher accustomed to such powerful arguments could carry by them the same kind of conviction he formerly produced, and would be pleased to try them again; but he seems to have forgotten that in Delaware, whenever a school-master takes part against the interest of his own country, and sides with a foreign government, by teaching his pupils lessons inconsistent with their duty to their country and what they owe to their own character for patriotism, the boys are authorized to use the arguments *a posteriori*, and striking ones, too, on the master. [Laughter.]

Well, sir, what course has the senator taken here in the debate? He has rested upon nothing as an authority for his main position but the declarations in the British despatches. He has taken sides—and he cannot deny it—against the construction placed by his own government upon the treaty of 1850—ay, by the administration of which he is himself a professed supporter. He built his whole conclusion upon one passage in Lord Clarendon's despatch, and another in the letter of the Queen's advocate, declaring that Central America was not what the constitution of Central America declared it to be, but something else of a geographical character; and the honorable senator never ventured to define to us what that was. He has produced, and can produce, no reliable map showing Central America in any other political, historical, or geographical and proper sense but that in which I explained it to the Senate. His quibble upon the translation of the words "Central America," in the Spanish version of our treaty with that country in 1825, is amusing. He says that means "the centre of America." I suppose nothing can be more central than the centre; and when we see how the phrase in that treaty is translated in our Volume of Treaties, as identical with "Central America," in every place where "Centro America" occurs—when we see the treaty was exchanged by a minister who represented himself in the ratification as from "Central America," we may judge how hard the senator was pressed to find a subterfuge. Central America and the centre of America are convertible terms. But he says admit this—yet the government of Central America has ceased to exist. So has that of the Roman empire. Yet he has no right to misrepresent the geography of the Roman empire, or to say it never existed, and did not give a name to a portion of the earth's surface. His argument, if it could have any effect whatever, would release Great Britain from the obligations of the treaty.

Sir, there cannot be a doubt now, if you will trace this discussion back to its commencement, that the very debate which the honorable senator originated here on the 6th of January, 1853, gave Great Britain the first hint to speak of the declarations of the negotiators as affecting the construction of the treaty. The British government evidently made the despatch of the 27th of May upon his authority, and he now quotes that despatch to sustain him. In effect, they quote him and he quotes them, and neither of them has any other authority for their error.

The honorable senator undertakes to refer to a map which I brought here from the State Department, and he says the same map is in the Secretary's office. Sir, he did not correctly quote the map which I produced. The title of it was read the other day by the Secretary. It was not, like the map in the Secretary's office, "Central America, and a part of Texas and of California;" but it was "Central America, *including* Texas and California." The outlines upon it showed that it did *include* all Texas and all California. The map he refers to in the Secretary's office is a different map, but it is one of the last maps he should cite, as it proves a part of the Union is included in Central America. The argument which I drew from it was this—and the gentleman has not answered it, and cannot answer it—that if you take Central America in that loose geographical sense which he says he adopted when he voted for the treaty, then he himself intended to vote Texas and California out of the Union, by providing that neither Great Britain nor the United States should occupy, fortify, colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion in any part of Central America. Yes, sir, by his construction, as I have already said, the senators from Texas who voted for that treaty, not only voted their own State out of the Union, but voted themselves out of the Senate. This is the absurdity to which I reduced the argument of the honorable senator by the exhibition of that map, and consequences equally absurd flow from that in the Secretary's office.

With regard to the islands of Roatan, Bonacca, Utila, and the other little keys called the Bay islands, the honorable senator undertakes to make an argument in favor of the British claim. He tries to bring them within the description of dependencies of Belize. The British minister, [Mr. Crampton,] much more fair towards our country than the honorable senator himself, says in substance that he does not understand the matter so, and that all the dependencies of the Belize that he knows anything of are the small islands embraced in the triangle described in the fifth article of the treaty of London of July 14th, 1786, and the little island of Cayo Casina, or St. George's Key, named in the fourth article. The British minister is more just to us than the honorable senator. He would argue these islands of Roatan, Bonacca, &c., under the declarations of the negotiators, into dependencies of Belize; and it has been suggested that the British government, finding itself thus supported by so distinguished and able an advocate, would take his construction and endeavor to show that these islands are dependencies of Belize. Sir, the senator himself said in the course of the debate that these islands were three hundred miles from Belize. The little islands that are dependencies are only a few leagues from Belize.

Roatan was not known as a dependency in 1850. I endeavored to show that in law a colony, where dominion or sovereignty is exercised, cannot be the dependency of a mere settlement. The opposite position is making the greater inferior to the lesser, which is an absurdity on its own face. The very map that I brought here showed, among other things, what a great many other British maps will show, that before the honorable senator put his construction upon the word "dependencies," Roatan was marked out, not as a part of Central America, but as part of the British West Indies.

The honorable senator, finding Mr. Crampton disposed to be fair towards our country, says he has made a great mistake, and turns upon that gentleman quite as fiercely as if he himself were a British minister in the British Parliament denouncing Mr. Crampton for having given a different interpretation to the despatches from that which they bear—an interpretation favorable to the United States, and hostile to the interests of Great Britain. Sir, an American senator ought to be one of the last men on earth to complain that a British minister has done justice to his own country. That is the weight of his complaint. The head and front of Mr. Crampton's offending hath this extent—no more. He has endeavored to prevent what he thought would be the result of Lord Clarendon's despatch—an unnecessary and unjust excitement among the people of the United States against his own country; and therefore he confesses frankly and honorably that, in his own individual opinion, the despatch contained errors, and he has freely stated them. For this the gentleman rebukes him. He rebukes him because he has had the manliness to acknowledge an error on his own side, and the right on ours. If the senator can find satisfaction in adopting such a course as that, I leave him to the enjoyment of it. I could not. Whenever a foreign minister makes a concession in favor of the interests of my country, I will gladly avail myself of it to defend my country. If the British government should disclaim his construction, he will not stand less high among honorable men for the manliness of having stated what he believed to be the truth. But he believes the minister at home will sustain him. Let us await the result. I have announced my determination, in case they intend to adhere to the language of Lord Clarendon's despatch. I shall be gratified, however, if Mr. Crampton is sustained.

The senator, in some degree, changes his position in his reply. He says his complaint now is not so much that Great Britain has occupied Belize, but that she has occupied the country beyond it, and encroached upon the Central American States. Was that my fault, or the fault of the treaty? If the encroachments occurred before the treaty, then the treaty excludes her from all territory which is within the limits of those States or their proper dependencies; and if she has not been compelled to observe the treaty, President Taylor, who died immediately after it, or his administration, could not be censured for that. As little are they censurable for any encroachments which may have occurred since. Let those who are or may become answerable for the violation of the treaty respond to the honorable senator. It is a matter which he will have to settle with his own friends.

I have always regretted that the discussion upon the treaty arose in public session. It was not my fault that a public debate was ever had here upon it. The remarks in open session last year involved me so essentially that it became indispensable for me to maintain in my just defence what I have said here in reply in public session. The public debate was commenced by the oldest senator in the body, teaching by example what is to be done hereafter. He had an opportunity, he thought, of making an attack upon me. It has failed, and he has become the victim of his own rashness; but in future, no matter what may be the motive that shall instigate a man in getting up a debate of this description, I trust it will never be attempted to discuss matters which at the time are the subjects of actual negotiation in public session.

At the time the Mexican protocol was sent here I was a member of the Senate of the United States. The debate upon it commenced in open session. I listened with pain, and I made efforts, as the record of our debates will show, to induce gentlemen to suffer the discussion to go into executive session, where we could freely interchange our opinions without sending them necessarily abroad. I thought I saw that the next administration of the country would be embarrassed in defending that protocol, if every man here were allowed to utter any objection which might occur to him at the passing moment against the conduct of the commissioners and of the President in regard to it. I succeeded. We arrested the debate, and we never resumed it.

Sir, there would be just as much propriety, tact, and sagacity shown by a whist-player who should throw down his hand before his opponents and ask them to play to it, as the senator has shown by his public speeches on these subjects. He tells everything he thinks; the foreign government hears it from one of the President's constitutional advisers, and takes advantage of it, of course. If they hear that declarations have been made, accompanying a treaty, which go so far that they may invalidate the treaty, will they not seize upon them, especially if those declarations happen to come from a strong man, one occupying a high position before the country, as the senator from Michigan has done, and does now? Surely they can say to themselves, "We shall find friends, and fast ones, when he has said so much in our favor;" and then, if they throw the treaty to the winds, who is to be blamed for it? I leave the honorable senator to reflect upon this at his leisure.

Sir, the signature to the power to exchange ratifications, and the proclamation of the exchange, were the last official acts of President Taylor. No matter what may be done in regard to these acts, or anything else connected with his administration, we know he will not feel it,

——"Nor steel, nor poison,
Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing
Can touch him further."

But it did seem to me, and it has during the whole of this debate, that it would have been eminently worthy of the high and magnanimous character which the honorable senator from Michigan seeks to sustain before his countrymen that he should have been the last man to assail, by such means as he has resorted to, these official acts after the death of his great rival. Instead of thus carping at and unjustly censuring the doings of the administration of his successful competitor for the presidential office, and thus diminishing the estimate of his public character, he would have elevated himself by adhering to a more generous policy—

"Great let me call him, since he conquered me."

Mr. CASS. There is one remark which was made by the honorable senator—the last one which he used—in regard to which only I feel it necessary to say a word. No man ever heard me, during the lifetime of the lamented President to whom he refers, utter one disrespectful word of him; nor has any man heard me say a word against his memory since he is dead. If any man knows anything to the contrary, I defy him to rise and say so. In the heat of the contest, while I was placed in opposition to him, I always maintained that he was a patriot and an upright man. Now, sir, it is the strangest doctrine in the world which is advanced by the honorable senator, that because a President is dead, you cannot therefore review important questions connected with his administration. Then, according to the honorable senator's position, the seal of death seals the measures of an administration, and they can no longer be inquired into. I humbly apprehend, sir, that we are as much at liberty to examine the course of an administration when the chief of it has departed, as we are to examine the course of one the head of which has surrendered the reins of government, but still resides among us. In both cases, however, it should be done in proper language. I have not said one word of General Taylor in connexion with this subject, but I have examined the whole matter as I thought proper.

On motion, the subject was ordered to lie on the table.

BELLS! BELLS! BELLS!—The subscribers manufacture and keep constantly on hand all sizes of church, factory, steamboat, forty, locomotive, school-house, and plantation bells. These bells are hung with the patent iron yokes with movable arms. They can be turned around so that the clapper will strike in a new place, which is desirable after a bell has been rung a few years. Springs are affixed in a new way to prevent the clapper from resting on the bell, thereby prolonging the sound. These bells are manufactured from the best stock, and are cast in iron castings. At this foundry these were first used, and are found to be a great improvement. We give a written warranty that if church bells break within one year from date of purchase, with fair usage, we will recast without charge. The tone of all bells is warranted. Nearly 9,000 bells have been cast and sold from this foundry, which is the best evidence of their superiority. We have fifteen gold and silver medals, awarded for the bells at various fairs, "for the best bells for sonorousness and purity of tone." We pay particular attention to getting up peals or chimes, and can refer to those furnished by us. Our foundry is within a few rods of the Hudson river, Erie canal, and railroads running in every direction. As this is the largest establishment of the kind in the United States, and has the largest assortment of bells, orders can be filled with great despatch. We can refer to bells in any part of the States. Old bells taken in exchange for new ones. Levels, compasses, &c., constantly on hand. Address

A. MENEELY'S SONS,
West Troy, N. Y.

May 21—1y5&cp

O. K. CHAMBERLIN'S Commercial College, located No. 197 Baltimore street, Baltimore, Maryland. The ostensible object of this institution is to place in the reach of individuals proper facilities for obtaining a thorough and practical mercantile education. A young man can here obtain a more correct knowledge of general business matters in a few weeks than can be acquired in as many years in any one counting-house.

The course of study embraces double-entry book-keeping, and its adaptation to various departments of commerce and trade. Mercantile calculations taught according to the most approved methods. Practical penmanship, combining rapidity of execution with beauty of construction. Lectures on mercantile law, upon various important mercantile subjects, beside many other points necessary for a book-keeper or business man to understand. The time necessary for a student to complete the course varies from five to eight weeks. There being no vacation, applicants can enter at any time and attend both day and evening. Examinations are held at stated periods, and diplomas awarded to those who graduate. For terms, &c., write and have a circular forwarded by mail.

Nov 12—1y5&cp

WAS committed to the Jail of Baltimore City and county, on the 5th day of January, 1854, by Isaac Cook, esq., a justice of the peace and for the city of Baltimore, a negro man, as a runaway, named Francis Johnson, who says he is free. He is of dark complexion, aged between 27 and 40 years, and 5 feet 8¼ inches in height. Had on when committed, a light drab frock coat, red flannel shirt, gray pantaloons, old black hat, and coarse boots; has a large scar on the left temple, and a scar on the forehead over the left eye, a whitlow on the end of the left thumb.

The owner (if any) of the above-described negro man is requested to come forward, prove property, pay charges, and take him away, otherwise he will be discharged according to law.

DANIEL E. MYERS,
Warden Baltimore City and County Jail.

Jan 25—1eow4t

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA; new revised edition, now in course of publication in Edinburgh. Imported, and for sale, at a much-reduced price, by LITTLE, BROWN, & CO.

Encyclopædia Britannica; or, Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Miscellaneous Literature. Eighth edition, greatly improved, and brought up to the present time. Edited by Thomas Stewart Traill, M. D., F. R. S. E., &c. With upwards of five hundred engravings on steel, and many thousand on wood.

This edition has undergone careful revision and extensive alteration, so as to accommodate it to the improved taste and advanced intelligence of the times. The editor has secured the co-operation of the most eminent living authors, who have contributed treatises in the various departments of science, literature, the arts, manufactures, commerce, statistics, and general knowledge, to supersede those now rendered obsolete by the progress of discovery, improvements in the arts, or the general advancement of society.

The work will be comprised in 21 volumes 4to. Volumes 1, 2, and 3 are now ready for delivery. Price, $5 50 per volume to subscribers.

Mr. C. S. Fairbanks is authorized to receive subscriptions for the work, and will call upon the residents of Washington for that purpose early in February.

LITTLE, BROWN, & CO.,
Boston.

Jan 24—ed6t

LOW-PRICED OILCLOTHS.—Just received and on sale—
19 sheets new style and pretty floor oilcloths, all of superior quality, at low prices
4 bales list and rag carpetings
2 cases 10-4 and 12-4 Allendale and Hamilton long cloth undressed cotton sheetings.
1 bale low-priced blankets
1 do oilcloths for steps, very cheap.

CLAGETT & DODSON,
Dealers in all kinds of carpetings, mattings, rugs, mats, floor, step, and table oilcloths, curtain materials, table and toilet linens and cottons, and all other kinds of furniture dry goods, Pennsylvania avenue, one door east of 9th street

Jan 24—tf2weo

GILLOTT'S and Perry's Pens, genuine.—The subscriber has just opened a large supply of Gillott's and Perry's best metallic pens, bought by himself from the manufacturers personally, so to avoid with certainty the counterfeits of their pens which have been made in England, in Europe, and in other countries. The supply embraces, in variety, the best kinds of each maker, and the best qualities and finish of each kind, bought without reference to cost, including the mapping, drawing, and lithographic pens; also, Gillott's box pens, (warranted genuine, but not recommended,) at 25 cents per gross.

FRANCK TAYLOR.

Jan 26

CITY of Pittsburg and County of Alleghany, Pennsylvania.—We offer for investment the guaranted coupon bonds of the city of Pittsburg and county of Alleghany, Pennsylvania.

These bonds are issued to the Pittsburg and Connellsville Railroad Company, by which they are guaranteed.

We confidently recommend them to capitalists as a secure and desirable investment.

The bonds, together with the exhibit, and other statistical information, may be obtained upon application personally, or by letter, to

JOHNSTON, BROTHERS, & Co.,
BANKERS & FISCAL,
Agents for the Pittsburg and Connellsville Railroad Company.

Jan 18—d&cptf

FOR CALIFORNIA.—The new, splendid, and unrivalled steamship Yankee Blade will sail for the Pacific on Tuesday