

FITCHBURG!

A. J. BROWN & CO.
INVITE the attention of Merchants to the under-mentioned, and a great variety of other Goods, which they will sell by the package, or repacked, at Most Extraordinary Low Prices.
CROCKERY WARE.
Crates Flowing Blue Ware, different patterns, very handsome and cheap;
Light Blue Printed Ware;
Dark do do do;
Blue Edged do do do;
Cream Colored do do do;
Yellow do do do do;
Fancy colored do do do.

China Ware.
Hhds. Broad Gold Band—Tea Sets and Plates;
Gold Edge an I Line do do do;
Brazed Blazed Figure do do do;
Blue do do do do do;
White French and English do do do.

GLASS WARE.
Casks Tumblers, 3000 doz.—very cheap;
Lamps, every variety;
Lanterns, every variety;
Dishes on foot;
do do do do do do do;
Jewelry Globes;
Caskets;
Jars—Glass and Tin;
do do do do do do do;
Preserve dishes, all sizes;
Boxes Solar and Camphine Chimneys;
Sals, Pressed and Cut;
Egg Globes;
Goblets, some very rich Cut;
Curtain Pins;
Camillesticks.

GERMAN MUGS AND VASES.
A Great Variety of Fancy Articles.
Britannia Ware.
A large assortment consisting of Coffee and Tea Pots, Castors, Cups, Mugs, Lamp, &c., &c., VERY CHEAP.

PAPER HANGINGS.
10,000 Pieces—price 5 cents per piece and upwards—printed and plain; Blue and Green Cur- tain paper.

Cutlery and Tea Trays.
Of our own importation, at 20 per cent less than Hardware Importers' prices.

SILVER PLATED WARE.
Castors, Table, Dessert and Tea Spoons, and Butter Knives, at Manufacturers' prices.

Our concerns were the first, AND ARE NOW THE ONLY ONE'S selling these Goods on the modern system of Low Prices, Small Profits, and Large Sales.

A. J. BROWN & CO., No. 1, Central Block, FITCHBURG, And 142 Main Street, WORCESTER, Mass.

Millinery & Dress Making.
Sign of the Big Blue Bonnet.

MRS. E. HINCKLEY.
GENTLEMANLY Ladies of Brattleboro, who have a variety for their patronage, while she has exerted herself to furnish them with the best and most approved styles of Millinery that could possibly be disposed of in the contracted space which she has just returned from New York with a more extensive assortment than usual—consisting of the following:
Shirred Bonnets,
Neapolitan Lace, Bird's Eye,
Rough and Realy, Cor's Rutland,
Fr. 13 Edges, Geneva, Coburg,
Milan Edges, Fr. Rutland,
French Lace, English Straws,
Dunstable.
Which she will dispose of as low as can be purchased.
Ribbons, Laces, Flowers,
kerchiefs, Fringes, a variety of Collars and Edgings,
Mourning Bonnets, Gown Closets, &c.,
Mantillas and Dress Patterns.
Dresses Cut in the most approved styles.
BONNETS Bleached and Pressed in no in-ferior manner, and on short notice.
WANTED, Apprentices well recommended, for 6 months, immediately.
Brattleboro, May 4, 1848.

DAQUERRETYPE.
The Vermont Daguerrian Gallery.
IS now being fitted up anew in the Hall's Long Build- ing. It will be opened for the reception of visit-ors, May 10th, 1848, when the proprietors will be happy to have a call from the citizens generally, and to show them our specimens; also our assort-ment of Gold Lockets, which will be sold very cheap, by the single one or by the dozen.
Operators that are in want of Lockets will find it to their advantage to give them a call before pur- chasing at Boston or other places.
Also, will be kept at their Gallery a large assort-ment of Plates, Cases, Chemicals and every thing appertaining to the Daguerreotype line, which will be sold at city prices. The patronage of operators in this section of the country is respectfully solicited.
Licenses taken out by the proprietors, also from Paintings, Daguerreotypes, Engravings, &c.
Pupils thoroughly instructed in the art, and furnished with instruments, if desired.
O. H. COOLEY, GEO. S. WEST.
May 4th, 1848.

Boots, Shoes, & Rubbers.
THE Subscriber has on hand, (I do not say the largest stock ever offered in Windham County,) yet I have a good assortment of Ladies', Gents', Misses', Children's and Boys' Boots, Shoes, Gaiters and Rubbers, which I offer low for Cash.
Rubbers of all kinds by the best manufactory.
N. B. Manufacturing of all kinds of Ladies', Gents', Misses' and Children's Boots and Shoes done on short notice, at the old stand.
Holt's Building.
P. SIMONDS, 12.

AT CHASE & CRANDALL'S Gentlemen's Furnishing Store.
MAY be found a large assortment of Stocks, Silk and Sate Scarfs, French Yarn Neck Ties, Bosoms, Collars, Silk and Cotton Hosiery, French Kid and Wash Leather Gloves, Lisle Thread and Cotton do, Suspensorys, Shirts and Drawers, Dressing Gowns, Gaiters, Umbrellas, &c.
N. B. Shirts made to order at short notice.
May 2, 1848.

G. C. HALL.
HAS the greatest bargains in DEY GOODS to be found in Brattleboro. His stock, purchas- ing in New York and Boston, is extensive, compre- hending all reasonable descriptions. And he will sell for cash at a very small advance.

Potash and Lime.
FOR SALE by J. C. MERRILL, Brattleboro, March 16.

Speech of Mr Upham, ON THE TEN REGIMENT BILL, In the United States Senate, February 10, 1848.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not know, sir, that I shall be able, in the humble part I am about to take in this debate, to impart any thing of interest or freshness to the subject, or to bring any new contribution of facts to bear upon the question I propose to discuss. Almost every topic connected with, or growing out of the existing war with Mexico, has been alluded to and ably commented upon by honorable Senators who have preceded me on the floor. But, sir, exhausted as the subject is, I cannot content myself as a silent voter on the question.

Believing, as I do, that under existing laws, our force in Mexico can be increased to nearly sixty-five thousand men, and that the more vigorous prosecution of the war for the purpose now avowed, would be dishonorable to the country, I shall be compelled to record my vote against this bill. But, I shall do it, sir, with no view to embarrass the Executive in his efforts for an honorable peace; but to prevent the forcible dismemberment of a weak, distracted sister republic; and to preserve unimpaired the fair fame of the country, which I prize infinitely higher than any territorial acquisitions we can make, or any glory we can win, by the success of our arms. The honorable Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in his eloquent remarks the other day, in support of this bill, expressed a desire that it might pass without opposition, and that the discussion, which he was aware could arise upon the war policy of the Administration, which he has so much desired to avoid, might be had upon some other measure, hereafter to come before the Senate. This bill, he thought, was safe and common ground, upon which we could all meet and act together. Sir, safe as the honorable Senator may think the ground to be on which he stands, I cannot occupy it with him, because, in my judgment, it is dangerous ground.

When Texas was annexed to the United States, its western boundary was left an open question, to be settled by negotiation, between the Mexican Government and ours. The President, in his message of May 11th, 1846, informed Congress that a strong desire to regulate and adjust our boundary and other causes of difference with Mexico, on fair and equitable principles, induced him, in September, 1845, to seek the reopening of diplomatic negotiations between the two countries; that the Mexican Govern- ment, in October following, agreed to receive a minister from the United States invested with full powers to settle and adjust every existing difference; and that the Mexican Government had not only refused to receive him, or to listen to his propo- sitions, but, after a long continued series of menaces, had invaded our territory, and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on our own soil. This message was accompanied by about one hundred and fifty pages of manuscript documents. The usual notice to print the documents was made, but it was voted down by Senators on the other side of the chamber. A call for the reading was then made, but that also was refused, and the bill of the 13th May, 1846, was passed by a vote of forty yeas to two nays.

The uniformity with which this bill was passed, has been frequently referred to as evidence to show that Congress was almost unanimously of the opinion that Mexico commenced the war. The President, in his last annual message, referring to this subject, says, in substance, that Congress, by the act of the 13th May, 1846, declared, with great unanimity, that "by the act of the republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States, there being but two negative votes in the Senate and fourteen in the House of Representatives." Now, sir, I propose to present to the Senate and the country all the facts connected with the passage of that bill. The bill originated in the House of Representatives. On the 27th of January, 1846, Mr Harrison, from the committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill to authorize the President of the United States, under certain circumstances therein mentioned, to accept the services of volunteers, and for other purposes. On the 11th of May, Mr Brinkerhoff moved to amend the bill by inserting a new section, to be inserted in the words following: "Whereas, by the act of the republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States." The amendment was carried by a vote of 123 yeas to 67 nays; and, on the same day, the bill passed the House by a vote of 174 to 14. So it appears that 67 members of the House voted against the preamble to the bill.

Well, sir, what is the history of this bill in the Senate? On the 13th of May, it came up for consideration, and Mr Huntington, then a Senator from Connecticut, since deceased, moved to amend it by striking out the preamble; and the journal shows that the motion failed by a vote of 18 yeas to 28 nays—all the Senators on this side of the chamber, with the exception of three, voted in the affirmative. A motion was then made by the honorable Senator from Kentucky, (Mr CHITTENDEN,) to take a vote upon the preamble alone, but the chair ruled that it could not be separated from the bill, and the motion was decided out of order. The bill was then presented to a vote and passed—yeas 40, nays 10. Mr Berrien, Mr Evans, Mr Huntington, and Mr Calhoun declining to vote, and eleven Senators on this side of the chamber voting yeas with a protest against the preamble to the bill. This, sir, is a concise history of the progress of the bill through the two Houses of Congress.

Now, I ask, in all candor, what cause can the President tender to the country for asserting in his message, that both branches of Congress, with great unanimity, declared that the war existed by the act of Mexico. There being but fourteen negative votes in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate? Sir, the journal of the House shows 67 negative votes, and the journal of the Senate shows 18, making in the whole

85. Mr CLAYTON. Will the Senator allow me a word? Mr UPHAM. Certainly. Mr CLAYTON. At the time the bill passed this Senate, those of us who voted for its passage after our failure in the effort to strike out the preamble, as the Senator from Vermont has stated, put to the gentlemen on the other side the excessive hard-ship of calling upon us to vote for a bill, the object of which was to send supplies for the army, with a preamble containing a statement of a matter of fact of which we had not evidence before us. We repeatedly demanded the separation of the two propositions, but the apparatus was refused, the President of the Senate decided that we had no right to call for a division of the question. Then we insisted upon it that we should have the right to vote upon the bill protesting against the preamble. And the Senator from Missouri now in my eye will recollect perfectly what he said on that occasion, that such would be our right; and such was the understanding, that if we gave our votes in favor of the bill, we were to be regarded as voting for the supplies, but not in favor of the preamble. This is the simple fact of the case, and that such was the understanding is well known. A Senator now deceased, (Mr Spright), distinctly, and over and over again, said that such was the understanding with regard to our vote. It is a gross misconception, therefore, to suppose that we voted for the preamble, or ever meant to vote for it. I hope this statement will be sufficient to prevent any injustice being done us upon this subject in all future time.

Mr UPHAM. I think the honorable Senator for the additional information he has given upon the subject—the country should have the whole truth in regard to the matter. Appeals were frequently made to Senators on the other side of the chamber, to strike out the preamble to the bill, as no evidence of its truth had been exhibited, and take a unanimous vote for the supplies; but they refused to do it. We must vote for the bill as it was, or take the responsibility of voting against it. General Taylor had been ordered to the left bank of the Rio Grande with a small force, and forces were entertained, that he would be unable to sustain himself without reinforcements; and the bill was passed for his relief. No intimation was made by the Executive, that the war had been waged with a view to the permanent acquisition of Mexican territory by conquest. The message declared it to be a war of defence, and not of aggression. "Mexico," says the message, "has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory, and shed American blood upon the American soil." To enable the President to repel this invasion, and to prosecute the war to a speedy and successful termination, I voted for the bill of the 13th May, 1846. Well, sir, what said the President in regard to the war, in his message of December, 1846? Hear his language:

"The war has not been waged with a view to conquest; but having been commenced by Mexico, it has been carried into the enemy's country, and will be vigorously prosecuted there, with a view to obtain an honorable peace." Here, sir, conquest, "with a view to permanent occupancy of Mexican territory," is disavowed. The war had been carried into Mexico, to cripple her power, and compel her to make an honorable peace.—Again, sir, the President, in his message of August 4th, 1846, says: "Equally anxious to terminate, by a peace honorable to both parties, as I was originally to avoid the existing war, I have deemed it my duty again to extend the olive branch to Mexico. Should the Government of that republic accept the offer, in the same friendly spirit by which it was dictated, negotiations will speedily commence for the conclusion of a treaty." "A peace honorable to both parties" was the object desired. "The chief difficulty to be anticipated in the negotiation," says the President—"Is the adjustment of the boundary between the parties, by a line which shall be at once satisfactory and convenient to both, and such as neither will hereafter be inclined to disturb. This is the best mode of securing perpetual peace and good neighbor-ship between the two republics.—Should the Mexican Government, in order to accomplish these objects, be willing to cede any portion of their territory to the United States, we ought to pay them a fair equivalent; a just and honorable peace, and not conquest, being our purpose in the prosecution of the war." The boundary question was the matter in dispute between the two countries—and should the Mexican Government, for the purpose of establishing a line convenient for both parties, be willing to cede a portion of territory to the United States, we ought to pay a fair equivalent for it. No cession of territory was to be required without the free consent of the Mexican Govern- ment. But this is not all, sir; the President asked for an appropriation of \$3,000,000, to enable him to advance a portion of the consideration money, for any cession of territory the Mexican Government might be willing to make. The character and objects of the war having thus announced to Congress and the country, I, with most of the Senators on this side of the chamber, at the last session of Congress, voted yeas and nays for its prosecution.

But, sir, I will leave this subject and pass to a brief review of the measure which occasioned the war, viz: the annexation of Texas, and the order of the 13th of January, 1846, for the march of the army from Corpus Christi to the left bank of the Rio Grande. For these two measures the democratic party and the President are responsible. And I therefore charge upon them the cost of the country. The annexation of Texas was a party measure. It was a scheme, devised by the democracy of the south, to prevent the abolition of slavery in Texas; and, when first announced, it met with no favor from the democracy of the north. It was denounced with great violence, and in language somewhat offensive, by the party press, and in the conversations of the people. The Globe, the lead-

ing democratic press in this city, joined in the opposition, and it was continued up to the meeting of the democratic convention in Baltimore in May, 1844. Now, sir, as the honorable Senator from Illinois thought it his duty to convey through the Senate to the country the denunciations of a portion of the clergy and the press against the war of 1812, I will follow his example, and present to the Senate the denunciations of the northern democracy against the annexation of Texas, when the scheme was first announced to the country. I shall do this, sir, with no view to cast reproach upon the people of Texas, but to show that, with the northern democracy, obligations to country are sometimes overcome by obligations to party.

On the 20th of November, 1843, the Dover Gazette, N. H., a democratic paper, in an article against annexation, spoke of Texas in the following language: "Texas can hardly be in a worse state than it is now—the most wicked, vile, God-abandoned place of which we have any knowledge—its history would make the savage blush with shame. Yet there are some who desire to effect an union between Texas and this country, as if we had not enough guilt and crime already upon our shoulders. We wish rather that we could get an impassable gulf between us and its borders. That its benefits of pros- perity might never reach our shores.— Heaven save us from a union with Texas." The New Hampshire Patriot (democratic paper) of November 9, 1843, in speaking of the annexation of Texas, said: "The object and design throughout all is as black as ink—bitter as hell." "We hope, and sincerely trust there will be no trucking on the part of our northern representatives, when this mighty project shall come up before them in all its questionable shapes." The New Hampshire Patriot (democratic paper) of November 23, 1843, speaking of annexation, said: "He, (the President) and his gang will probably attempt to throw this question into Congress as a fire brand. It may produce mischief, but we trust the democrats have good sense enough to avoid being distracted by the acts of the enemy."

The Dover Gazette, New Hampshire, in the fall of 1843, in an article against the admission of Texas, among other things, said: "The admission of Texas into the Union would be a public disgrace, and a disgrace in the eyes of the civilized world. It would array against us the moral influence of all Christendom, and draw upon us the just retribution of an offended God." At a democratic convention held at Readfield, Maine, in the autumn of 1843, to nominate candidates for Congress, for the 3d Congressional District, the following resolution was adopted: "Resolved, That the impropriety and inexpediency of the annexation of Texas to the United States, oppose insuperable objections to its admission into the Union; and that the silly representation of federal presses, that the democratic party are in alliance with the slave power of the South, in a systematic design to effect the admission of Texas, is entirely unsupported by any facts, or by the slightest indications in any quarter, giving such a supposition the appearance of truth; and is, therefore, a wilful and deliberate fabrication of the federal party for base and partisan purposes." Here, Mr President, we have the views of the patriotic democracy of the 3d Con- gressional District in Maine upon the subject of Texas annexation. The charge that the democratic party were in favor of the measure, is declared to be a wilful falsehood, uttered by the federal party for base and partisan purposes. But, sir, this hostility to annexation was not confined to the 3d Congressional District in Maine; the democracy of the whole State opposed it by strong resolutions passed in the House of Representatives in the winter of 1843.

Here, sir, are the resolutions of the Democratic Legislature of Massachusetts passed in 1843: "Resolved, That under no circumstances whatever, can the people of Massachusetts regard the proposition to admit Texas into the Union, in any other light than as dangerous to its continuance in peace, in order to accomplish these objects, be willing to cede any portion of their territory to the United States, we ought to pay them a fair equivalent; a just and honorable peace, and not conquest, being our purpose in the prosecution of the war." "Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts, in the Congress of the United States, be requested to spare no exertions to oppose—and, if possible, to prevent—the adoption of the proposition referred to." "Resolved, That his Excellency, the Governor, be requested to transmit one copy of these resolutions to the Executive of each of the United States, and a like copy to each Senator and Representative in Congress from Massachusetts."

The democracy of Massachusetts regarded the admission of Texas into the Union as dangerous to its perpetuity, and under no circumstances whatever, could they consent to it. Ex-President Van Buren in a letter to Mr Hammett, under date of April 20, 1844, opposed annexation, because, in his judgment, it would involve us in a war with Mexico. And the Washington Globe of the first of May, 1844, contains the following editorial article: "We concur with Mr Van Buren fully and cordially in this view, and say it is the only wise, honorable, safe, and practicable course. Mexico said Texas are now at war: the armistice admits it. (a circumstance of which we were not apprised when we wrote our first article on this subject); and to adopt the Texas as our citizens at this time, is to make ourselves a party to the war, and to take upon ourselves the business of its conclusion, either by negotiation or by arms. It requires no declaration of war from Mexico to involve us—From the moment we admit Texas, we make her a territory of the Union; and it would be unlawful and punishable in her to treat with Mexico or to fight alone with Mexico. The United States alone could treat or fight; and thus, from the day of the ratification of this treaty, the United

States and Mexico would be at war; commerce between them would cease, and they would remain at war, and commerce would be broken up, until the negotiation or the arms of the United States terminated the dispute. This is clear common sense, and no one can deny it."

"We have been looking a little further in the published documents which accompany the treaty, and every step amazes us more and more. We find that Lord Aberdeen and the British Minister here utterly deny the Duff Green story, sent from London in August last, of the designs of England upon Texas, which is made the foundation of this whole proceeding. We believe it can easily be proved, that the whole scheme of getting up the Texas question, precisely as that question now is, existed long before Duff Green furnished that pretext, and that all this story of British interference, now put forth as the pretext for the moment, has been invented since the movement was organized."—Globe, May 4, 1844.

"If the General Government should take this step, in violation of the treaty with Mexico, would the character of our country be left to our posterity the same noble and honorable inheritance which was bequeathed to us by Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson? "We do not believe the great mass of our countrymen are willing to sacrifice the honor, the renown, and the real glory of this country for any earthly acquisition. If then, Texas has admitted, by a solemn proclamation, the existence of a war between herself and Mexico; if the Government of the United States has, by a solemn official document, declared its full knowledge that this is the state of the relations between Texas and Mexico, how can the President and Senate of the United States, without sacrific- ing the honor of the country, adopt this war with Mexico, in the face of our treaty of peace with that country?"—Globe, May 15, 1844.

Here, sir, we have not only a full en- dorsement of Mr Van Buren's views against annexation, but a strong argument showing that Mexico and Texas were at war, and that the adoption of the measure would make us a party to the war, and compel us to bring it to a conclusion, either by negoti- ation or by arms. "The ground I assume is, that the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande being disputable, and most of it in possession of Mexico, the President had no right to take forcible possession of it, even if it rightfully belonged to the state of Texas, without authority from Congress."

"We have had many questions of disputed boundary with foreign nations, and no ad- mission, except the present, ever thought of taking forcible possession of the disputed territory. Our north-western bound- ary was in dispute from the peace of 1783 to 1842, and no attempt was made by any of our Presidents to take possession, by force, of the territory we claimed. But, Mr President, various pretences have been set up to justify the march of our army to the left bank of the Rio Grande. The hon- orable Senator from Maryland, (Mr John- son,) in his eloquent speech upon this ques- tion said, that the United States had re- ceived the republic of Texas into the Union without antecedently defining her boundar- ies, and under a constitution including the disputed territory; and, therefore, they were bound to defend it. Sir, the constitu- tion of Texas, formed after the passage of the resolution of annexation, and under which she was admitted as a state of this Union, did not define her south-western boundary—that was left an open question to be settled by negotiation between the United States and Mexico. Again, Mr President, the honorable Senator said that Mexico had mustered an army on the Rio Grande with the declared object of invading Texas, and recovering the whole to her own sovereignty, and that we had a clear, undeniable right to meet her there and strike the first blow. But I understood the Senator to admit, that our right to meet her there and strike the blow could be justified only upon the principle of self- defence. If we were in no danger of a blow from Mexico—if she had no force collected for the invasion of Texas, then our unjustifiable act of hostility. Now, sir, where is the evidence that Mexico had mustered an army on the Rio Grande with the declared object of invading and conquering Texas? Did the President say any- thing of the kind in his message of the 11th of May, 1846, informing Congress that he had ordered the army to the left bank of the Rio Grande? No, sir, he assigned no such reason for the order. He said in that message that our force remained at Corpus Christi until after he had received such in- formation from Mexico as rendered it prob- able, if not certain, that the Mexican Govern- ment would refuse to receive our envoy. Our army, then, was ordered to occupy the left bank of the Rio Grande, because the President apprehended that Mexico would reject our envoy. Now, Mr President, to show that Mexico had mustered no army on the Rio Grande with a view to the invasion of Texas, and that the President knew it when he issued the order of the 13th Jan- uary, 1846, I call the attention of the Sen- ate and the country to Gen. Taylor's cor- respondence with the War Department while he remained at Corpus Christi."

In a despatch to the War Department, dated Corpus Christi, August 30, 1845, Gen. Taylor says that— "Caravans of traders arrive occasionally from the Rio Grande, but bring no news of importance. They represent that there are no regular troops on that river, except at Matamoras, and do not seem to be aware of any preparations for a demonstration on this side of the river. On the 6th of September, 1845, in another despatch, he says: "I have the honor to report that a confi- dential agent, despatched some days since to Matamoras, has returned, and reports that no extraordinary preparations are going forward there; that the garrison does not seem to have been increased, and that our consul is of opinion there will be no declaration of war."

Again, in another despatch of Septem- ber 14th, 1845, Gen. Taylor says: "We have no news of interest from the frontier. Arista, at the last accounts, was at Mier, but without any force; nor is there, as yet, any concentration of troops on the river." "In a despatch under date of October 11th, 1845, he says that— "Recent arrivals from the Rio Grande bring no news, or information of a different aspect from that which I reported in my last. The views expressed in previous com- munications relative to the pacific disposi- tion of the border people on both sides of the river are confirmed." "And in another despatch under date of January 7, 1846, he says: "We have many arrivals from Matamor- as and other points on the river, but they bring no intelligence of interest. A recent scout of volunteers from San Antonio struck the river near Presida, Rio Grande, and the commander reports everything quiet in that quarter."

Who, Mr President, with this evidence before him, can say that Gen. Taylor, on the 13th of January, 1846, was ordered to the Rio Grande to meet and repel a Mexi- can army there collected for the invasion of Texas? On the 7th of January, only six days before the order was issued, Gen. Taylor informed the President that every thing was quiet in that quarter. But, sir, the honorable Senator from Illinois, (Mr Doug- lass), has attempted to justify the order, on another ground. He says it was issued on the recommendation and at the request of Gen. Taylor. If this were true it would be no justification for the President. The expedi- ency of such a measure was a question for Congress to settle. General Taylor had nothing to do with it. But, Mr President, the army was not ordered to the Rio Grande on the recommendation of General Taylor. All he said upon the subject is contained in his letter to the War Department, under date of October 4th, 1845, more than three months before he received orders to leave Corpus Christi. In that letter he says: "It will be recollected that the instruc- tions of June the 15th, issued by Mr Bancroft, then Acting Secretary of War, directed me to select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and will be best adapted for repelling invasion, &c." "After assigning the reasons which induced him to concentrate his force at Corpus Christi, he proceeds as follows: "It is with great deference that I make any suggestions on topics which may be- come matter of delicate negotiation; but if our government, in settling the question of boundary, makes the line of the Rio Grande an ultimatum, I cannot doubt that the set- tlement will be facilitated and hastened by our taking possession at once of one or two suitable points on or quite near that river. Our strength and state of preparation should be displayed in a manner not to be mistaken."

"If our Government had determined, at all events, to make the Rio Grande the western boundary of Texas, the sooner we let Mexico know it the better. This is the sum and substance of all General Taylor said upon the subject. His suggestion was based upon the ground that the line of the Rio Grande was our ultimatum. Mr President, there must have been, at the bottom of this movement, something more than a desire to settle upon just and honorable terms the western boundary of Texas; and I will endeavor to show what it was. Our Government was aware that the annexation of Texas would give offence to Mexico, and an effort was made to reconcile her to the measure. On the 19th of April, 1844, Mr Calhoun, the Secretary of State, directed Mr Green, our Charge d'Affaires in Mexico, to inform that Govern- ment that a treaty for the annexation of Texas to the United States had been signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the two Govern- ments, and would be sent to the Senate, without delay, for its approval. In making this fact known, Mr Green was directed to give the Mexican Government the strongest assurance that, in adopting the measure, we were actuated by no feelings of disrespect or indifference to the honor or digni- ty of Mexico; and that the step was forced upon the United States in self-defence, in consequence of the policy adopted by Great Britain in reference to the abolition of slav- ery in Texas. Mr Green was further en- joined to assure the Mexican Government that it was our desire to settle all questions between the two countries which might grow out of the treaty, or any other cause, on the most liberal terms, including that of boundary. On the 23d of May Mr Green gave the Mexican Government notice of the treaty and strong assurance that the ques- tion of boundary would be settled on the most liberal terms."

On the 10th of September, 1844, Mr Calhoun, as Secretary of State, directed Mr Shannon, our Minister in Mexico, to renew to the Mexican Government the decla- ration made by our Charge d'Affaires, that if annexation should be consummated, the United States would be prepared to ad- just all questions growing out of it, including that of boundary, on the most liberal terms. Well, Mr President, after having given these strong assurances to Mexico, in re- gard to the question of boundary, we passed the resolution annexing Texas to the United States, and it was approved on the 1st of March, 1845.

On the 15th of June, 1845, about three months after the passage of the resolution, and five months before Texas accepted our proposition of annexation, the President ordered General Taylor to the left bank of the Rio Grande to protect what, in the event of annexation, was to be our western border. Yes, Mr President, before annexation was consummated, the administration, notwithstanding the strong assurances given to Mexico, that the question of bound- ary would be settled upon the most liberal terms, had determined that the Rio Grande should be the western boundary of Texas. Was this acting in good faith towards Mexi- co? Was it calculated to allay her oppo- sition, and reconcile her to annexation? No, sir, it was calculated to increase her hostility to the measure, and widen the breach between the two Governments. Mr SEWELL. The order of the 16th of June was, that General Taylor should re- main on the Sabine

Mr UPHAM. I have it in my hand and will read it.

The Acting Secretary of War, in his or- ders to General Taylor, under date of June 15th, 1845, says: "The point of your ultimate destination is the western frontier of Texas, where you will select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande Del Norte, such site as will consist with the health of the troops, and to protect what, in the event of annexation, will be our western border."

Here, sir, is the declaration of the Presi- dent, by his Secretary of War, that, in the event of annexation, the Rio Grande will be our western border. I was, therefore, correct in the assertion that the Adminis- tration had determined, long before annexation was consummated, to force upon Mexi- co the boundary of the Rio Grande. And, Mr President, if time would permit, I could show by the correspondence of the War Department with our military and naval officers in Mexico that the Executive, after he had yielded to Great Britain 5 deg. 40 min. of territory in Oregon, to which he had declared our title "clear and unquestionable," turned his attention to Mexico, with a fixed determination to wrest from her, by the sword, New Mexico and Upper California. On the 3d of June, 1846, the Secretary of War, in his despatch to Gen- eral Kearney, says: "It has been decided by the President to be of the greatest importance in the pending war with Mexico, to take the earliest possession of Upper California. An expedi- tion with that view is hereby ordered, and you are designated to command it."

In a despatch to Col. Stevenson, under date of September 11th, 1846, the Secre- tary says, "the military occupation of Cali- fornia is the main object in view." In an- other despatch, to Commodore Sloat, com- manding our naval forces in the Pacific Ocean, under date of July 12th, 1846, he says: "The object of the United States is, under its rights as a belligerent nation, to possess itself entirely of Upper California." Commodore Sloat, in his general order of July 7th, 1846, says, "it is not only our duty to take California, but to preserve it afterwards, as a part of the U. S. States, at all hazards." In regard to New Mexico, Gen- eral Kearney, in his letter to the Depart- ment of War, under date of August 24th, 1846, says: "On the 22d, I issued a proclamation, claiming the whole of New Mexico, with its then boundaries, as a territory of the United States of America, and taking it under our protection." "It is the wish and intention of the United States," (says Gen- eral Kearney in his proclamation,) "to pro- vide for New Mexico a free government, with the least possible delay, similar to those in the United States; and the peo- ple of New Mexico will then be called on to exercise the rights of freemen in electing their own representatives to the Territorial Legislatures."

I have not time, Mr President, to pursue this branch of the subject further. The extracts I have read show, beyond all doubt, that the war was waged for the acquisition of Mexican territory, by conquest, and not to compel a just and equitable settlement of the boundary between the two countries.

Mr President, I have already trespassed too long upon the patience of the Senate, and I will bring my remarks to a close. The career of conquest upon which we have entered, is full of danger and peril to the country. It may bring under our dominion foreign states and provinces, but it will bring with them an ignorant, degraded, population, wholly unprepared for the main- tenance of our free and liberal institutions. With the extension of our territorial limits, will come an increase of armies and navies, and the building up of a great military power, never contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. An increase of Execu- tive patronage will follow, and an ambitious President, selected from the successful com- manders of the army, may trample the Constitution under foot, and subject the people to the despotism of military rule. If they appeal to the Constitution and laws for protection, they will be answered in the lan- guage of Caesar to Metellus, "that arms and laws never flourish at the same time." Mr President, I call on the student of history, and we have many in this chamber, to point me to a nation, either ancient or modern, that has by its wars of conquest, acquired any enduring glory, or conferred any lasting benefits upon its people.

Did Greece gain any enduring fame by the wars of conquest in which she engaged? No, sir, Grecian liberties perished at Cha- rones, more than two thousand years ago. Rome carried her victorious arms into neighboring provinces, and subjected them to her dominion, but she could not save her republic. Roman liberties were cloven down by Roman armies on the battle-field of Philippi, more than thirty years before the Christian era. What has France gained by the wars of invasion and conquest in which she has established her power in the countries around her. She drenched the continent of Europe in blood, in her wars of con- quest. And what is her condition now?—She is confined to her ancient limits.—What has Russia gained by her conquest of the Caucasian country. Nothing sir; she received the submission of the people in 1796, and from that day to this, she has been compelled to keep in the field an army of twenty thousand men to defend and protect it. Mr President, aggressive war is no part of our mission—we can gain no en- during glory by the conquest of foreign states and provinces. The victories that redound most to our honor are achieved in the work-shops and counting houses of the country. We have a broad domain with every variety of soil and climate, and by in- dustry, enterprise, and energy, we can com- mand all the comforts and luxuries of life and secure for our country the admiration of the world.

As EDITOR BRUCE OTY.—The dwelling of Mr Faulkner, editor of the Norwich News, was partially destroyed by fire, on Saturday. Like a wise man, he was insured.