The Morning Post.

L. HARPER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

PITTSBURGH:
TUESDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 16, 1847.

Great Speech of General Cass.

We present *in extenso* to our readers this morning the great speech of Gen. Lewis Cass, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, which was delivered in the U. States Senate, on Wednesday last, on the Three Million Bill. We deem it unnecessary to request our readers to peruse this able speech carefully. We feel assured that it will be read not only by the Democracy but the whole American people, with the most intense interest. Gen. Cass has delivered many eloquent and powerful speeches, but in this instance we think he has excelled himself. Without the least desire to underrate the efforts of other distinguished statesmen, we cannot but express the opinion that the speech of Gen. Cass is the ablest delivered the present session—unanswered and unanswerable. He has taken an enlarged and patriotic view of our difficulties with Mexico, and shows beyond the possibility of a doubt that our country is clearly and indisputably in the right, federal whig *patriots* to the contrary notwithstanding! ☞ After reading the speech lend the paper to your neighbor.

Speech of General Cass,

In the U. S. Senate, February 10th, 1847,

ON THE

THREE MILLION BILL.

Mr. Cass said: In the remarks I propose to submit, Mr. President, I shall invert the natural order of arrangement. I intend to present my views of the causes and courses of the war thus far, and also the reasons which will induce me to vote for the appropriation of three millions of dollars. To which I shall add my views of the best mode of proceeding in the prosecution of the war. I shall begin, however, with the two latter subjects.

I do not rise, sir, with the emotions so visibly felt and eloquently described by the distinguished senator from South Carolina. I do not consider this country or its institutions in the slightest danger. Never was it more free, powerful, or prosperous than at the present moment, when intimely warnings come to assail us. The public sentiment may sleep upon his watchtower. In the distant horizon, not a cloud as big as the prophet's hand is to be seen, which is to overspread the heavens, and which is to burst in thunder and in tempest upon us. We are, indeed, engaged in a foreign war, which demands the solicitude of every good citizen. But the scene of its operations is two thousand miles distant; and come the worst that may, we can at any time withdraw into our own country. Disgraceful, indeed, would be such a movement; but it would be still better than the evils predicted, and according to the nature of the apprehensions expressed, it would terminate the danger.

Mr. President, it gives me great pain to hear any allusions to the dissolution of this confederacy; and of all the places in this republic, this high place is the last in which they should be expressed. The constitution is in no danger. It has survived many a shock, and it will survive many more. There are those now in the Senate—and I am among them—who were born before it came into being.

We have grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength, till the approach of physical infirmities, the kindly warnings of nature, bid us prepare for another and untried world. And the constitution, too, has grown with its growth and strengthened with its strength, till from 3,000,000 it governs 20,000,000 of people, and has made them the happiest community upon the face of the globe. But it is yet fresh in its strength. No infirmity has come to tell us that its dissolution is near. It is no longer an experiment, but experience; no longer a promise, but performance. It has fulfilled all, and more than all, than its most sanguine advocates dared predict. It is at this moment stronger in the affections of the American people than at any other period of its existence. Like the cliff of eternal granite, which overlooks the ocean, and drives back the ceaseless waves that assail its base, so will this constitution resist the assaults, that may be made upon it, come how or when, or whence they may. In the providence of God no such lot as ours was ever confided to any a people. What we have been and are, the past and the present have told, and are telling us. What we are to be, the future will tell to those who are to come after us, to their joy or sorrow, as we cherish or reject the blessings we enjoy. If we are not struck with judicial blindness, as were God's chosen people of old, and punished for national offences by national punishments, we shall cling to this constitution as the mariner clings to the last plank, when night and the tempest closes around him; and we shall cling to it the stronger, as the danger is greater.

Mr. President, I shall not touch any of the topics before us as a sectional man. I view them, and shall present them, as an American citizen, looking to the honor and interests of his country, and of his whole country. In these great questions of national bearing, I acknowledge no geographical claims. What is best for the United States is best for me, and in that spirit alone I shall pursue the discussion.

A strong desire pervades this country, that a region extending west of our present possessions to the Pacific ocean should be acquired and made part of our confederacy. The attempt to purchase it was made during the administration of General Jackson, and the hope of succeeding has never since been wholly abandoned. I will not detain the Senate by spreading out the reasons which render such a measure desirable. It would give to us a larger territory, a great deal of it calculated for American settlement and cultivation, and it would connect us with the great western ocean, giving it a front along its shore in connexion with Oregon of perhaps 13 or 14 degrees of latitude. It would give us also the magnificent bay of St. Francisco, one of the noblest anchorages in the world, capable of holding all the navies of the earth; and from its commanding position, controlling in some measure the trade of the northern Pacific. But, sir, besides these advantages, commercial and geographical, there are important political considerations, which point to extension as one of the great measures of safety for our institutions. The senator from South Carolina has presented some views upon this subject as true as they are striking. At the commencement of his life and of mine, this country contained 3,000,000 of inhabitants, giving a rate of increase which doubles our numbers every 22 years. There are those yet living who will live to see our confederacy numbering a population equal to the Chinese empire. This stupendous progress outstrips the imagination. The mind cannot keep up with the fact. It toils after it in vain; and as we increase in numbers and extend in space, our power of communication is still more augmented. The telegraph has come with its wonderful process to bind still closer the portions of this empire, as these recede from its capital. It is the most admirable invention of modern days. We can now answer the sublime interrogatory put to Job: "Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go, and say unto thee, Here we are!" Yes, the coruscations of Heaven, man has reduced to obedience, and they say unto him, Here we are. No man can tell what will be the effect of this discovery upon the destinies of the world. How it may bring nations together, and keep them together. And what influence it may produce by communicating events almost on the other side of the earth at the very moment of their occurrence. I have been industriously engaged seventeen days in coming from Detroit to Washington; and the journey between here and Baltimore once cost me two days. We have now a process within our reach, by which we can send to California, and receive an answer from there more than twenty times a day. I shall not pursue these investigations, they are sufficiently obvious in their general bearing, though the practical result of this great measure is beyond the reach of human vision.

We are at war with Mexico, brought on by her injustice. Before peace is established, we have a right to require of her a reasonable indimnity, either pecuniary or territorial, or both, for the injuries we have sustained. Such a compensation is just in itself, and in strict accordance with the usages of nations. One memorable proof of this has passed in our own time. When the allies entered Paris, after the overthrow of Napoleon, they compelled the French gavernment to pay them an indemnity of 1500,000,000 of francs, equal to 300,000,000 of dollars. In the condition of Mexico, there is no disposition in this country to ask of her an unreasonable sacrifice. On the contrary, the wish is everywhere prevalent, and I am sure the government participate in it, that we should demand less than we are entitled to. No one proposes a rigid standard by which the indemnity shall be measured. But there are certain territorial acquisitions which are important to us, and whose cession cannot injure Mexico, as she never can hold them permanently. We are willing, after settling the indemnity satisfactorily, to pay for the excess in money. The senator from South Carolina has stated the proposition very distinctly, "any excess on our part we are willing to meet, as we ought, by the necessary payment to Mexico."

Information received by the President, during the last session of Congress, induced him to believe, that if an appropriation for the purpose were made, the difficulties between the two countries might soon be terminated by an amicable arrangement. A proposition for that purpose was submitted to us in secret session, debated and approved by this Senate. It was then introduced into the legislature with open doors, passed the House of Representatives; and came to us. Here it was discussed until the stroke of the clock, when the hand on the dial plate pointing to 12, struck its funeral knell. In his message at the commencement of this Congress, the President renewed his suggestion, and the whole matter is now before us. Such is its history.

It is now objected to as an immoral proposition, a kind of bribery, either of the government of Mexico, or of its commanding general; and the honorable senator from Maryland, who is not now in his seat, said emphatically and solemnly, "that this project of terminating the war by dismembering a sister republic, is so revolting to my moral sense of propriety, honor, and justice, that I should see my arms palsied by my side, rather than agree to it." The "dismemberment" of which the honorable member speaks is previously defined by himself. That is the term he gives the acquisition, but I call it purchase. He says the money will go to Santa Anna and pay the army, which will thus be secured, and the poor "downtrodden" people be transferred to this country "in spite of themselves," in consequence of this "pouring of gifts into the hands of their tyrants."

Now, sir, there is no such proposition, as I understand it, nor any thing like it. The object of the President has been distinctly stated by himself It is to have the money ready, and if a satisfactory treaty is signed and ratified, then to make a payment into the treasury of Mexico which will be disposed of by the government of that country in such way as it may have. The propositions, both at the last session of Congress and this, were identical. The difference in the phraseology of the appropriation has been satisfactorily explained by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and seems to me of very little consequence. Be that as it may, it is not a subject which can produce of itself any practical difficulty. For if there is any member of the Senate, who is willing to vote for the appropriation, in the form in which it was presented last year, and is unwilling to vote for it in this, the Committee on Foreign Relations will cheerfully assent to the substitution of the latter for the former. "The principle is wrong," says the honorable senator from Maryland. But, in my view, the principle of this appropriation and of the other appropriation is precisely the same. And yet, the honorable senator from Maryland voted for the former, while he reprobates the present, and a number of other senators on that side of the chamber voted the last session in favor of the latter. If the proposition was bribery or unprincipled then, it seems to me it must be so now. Expediency may change with time, but right and wrong undergo no change.*

As to the idea that such an arrangement is something like bribery, it seems to me it will not bear the slightest investigation. A strange kind of bribery this. The appropriation called for was preceded by a message from the President to the Senate in secret session. It was then received in both houses, and the doors thrown open. It was discussed fully, not to say warmly, and was finally lost by the lapse of time. In secret session, the senators voted for it. It again takes a prominent place in the President's message at the commencement of the present session of Congress It has been before us between two and three months, and has been borne upon the wings of the wind to the remotest portions of our country. It entered Mexico long ago, and has been proclaimed in town and country. It is known to every citizen of that republic, who knows any thing of political affairs, whether the blood in his veins is Castilian, or Moorish, or Aztec. It has passed to Europe, and received the condemnations of many of its journals. Had it been approved there, I should doubt its policy or its justice. And for aught I know it is traveling along the canals of the Celestial Empire. I repeat, a strange kind of bribery this. That is an offence which does its work in secret. This is a proposition made by one nation to another in the face of the world. It is not to enable Mexico to carry on the war, as has been seen and die. No exchequer could bear the expense of the war is over. No man can tell what will be the result. Whatever history may pronounce upon this ceremony in Mexico it is significant enough of the disposition of the people towards us. Hence the difficulty of the government is increased, and hence the necessity of their strengthening themselves. Their revenues are drying up. They are always in debt in all their departments, civil and military. By a prompt payment into their treasury upon the ratification of a treaty, the government will be enabled to satisfy the most pressing demands, and thus to do an act of justice at home to counteract any ill effects of an act of justice abroad. And this is the very point of the whole matter. We may thus tempt them to do right, while so many other strong circumstances tempt them to do wrong. As to the application of this money, after it reaches the treasury of Mexico, it is no question of ours, any more than was the application of the consideration money paid to France and Spain for the purchase of Louisiana and Florida. We cannot follow it, and it must take its fate with the other resources of the country. It has one advantage, however, and that is its publicity. If the silver or gold were carried by wagons to the palace of the government, the transaction could have no more publicity than it has now. And this throws upon the authorities a much graver responsibility than do the ordinary payment, and one less likely to be abused. If all this is bribery, I am fully prepared to take my share of it. If it is bribery, let the honest governments of Europe make the most of it.

As to the comparison instituted by the honorable senator from Maryland, between this act and an attempt of the Mexican government to bribe General Taylor, it certainly gives me very little trouble. We have nothing to do with Santa Anna, as the general of an army. We deal with the government of Mexico. The very authority that makes the treaty is the authority to which the payment is to be made. If General Taylor were the American government, and had the power to cede away a portion of the American territory, the analogy would then exist in fact, and now it exists but in fancy. And this obvious consideration answers all the objection presented by the senator, when he expresses such an apprehension that the money would slip from our fingers before we secured a consideration. Not a dollar is to be paid till the treaty is ratified and the country thus made ours.

Passing now, sir, from the consideration of this subject to the course before us, I would observe that there are but three plans of operation by which we can escape from the difficulties of our position.

The first, is an abandonment of the war, and an inglorious return to our own country.

The second, is the establishment of a line over such a portion of the enemy's territory, as we think proper, and holding the country on this side of it without any further military operations.

The third, is a vigorous prosecution of the war, agreeably to the public expectation, and the experience of the world.

As to the first, sir, I do not place it in the category of things proposed; and I cast it from me with contempt.

The second, sir, is a very different proposition, supported by high names, civil and military, and it was yesterday presented to us with great power of argument and beauty of illustration by the distinguished senator from South Carolina. I shall state as succinctly as I can the reasons which induce me to consider this as an expedient, not to say an impossible proposition.

A plan of operations, seeking to hold a portion of a country properly guarded by fortresses and furnished with the necessary lines of communication, and seeking to do this without publicly announcing the nature of the plan and the determination to adhere to it, is one thing. An attempt to occupy another portion of country, open, unfortified, with no natural boundaries, and penetrable in all directions, and publicly proclaiming this system as an invariable one, not to be departed from, is another and quite a different thing.

From the Gulf of Mexico, following the boundaries of the provinces now in our possession, to the Pacific ocean, is but little short of 1000 miles. Far the greater portion of it is open, and much of it unoccupied. Instead of any lines of communication, natural or artificial, where it must necessarily be crossed, it may be crossed anywhere. It is a mere paper line—a descriptive one. For hundreds of miles on each side of a great part of such a line, the country is the same pastoral one rather than possessed by nomadic tribes, and affording subsistence and shelter to the beasts of the earth. If you assume such a boundary, you necessarily place yourself upon the defensive. You must establish troops along it, and these must be scattered occupying different positions. Your enemy then acts in masses, while you act in detachments. He attacks you, and is discomfited, he falls back behind his impenetrable barrier. A snake clutched by an eagle is one of the emblems of the armorial bearings of Mexico. If this plan of fighting to an air line is adopted, the proud bird will soon be powerless, and the reptile will coil itself up to strike at his leisure and its pleasure. In such a state of offensive defensive warfare, the enemy chooses his time when you least expect him or are least able to resist him. He gains your rear and cuts off your convoys and supplies, and thus reduces you to weakness and distress. He strikes you in a period of sickness, in a climate to which you are unaccustomed, and whose alternations do not affect him. You cannot pursue him into his country, for the moment, the very instant you do that, you confess the folly of your plan and abandon it forever. If you cross your boundary you must cross it to hold on, and then you have a new boundary, or a series of other works, or of unlimited operations. If you do not cross to hold on, what will you do? Your very object in crossing is to chastise the enemy; and you must pursue him to his fortresses and capture them, if he has any, or you must fight him in the open field and disperse him. I repeat, if you do not do this, you will be well punished for your temerity; you will certainly at the retiring enemy, take off your hats and say: Good bye gentlemen; we will wait till you come back again. The riches of Croesus would melt away before such a system of fighting and fighting. The laurels of Napoleon would wither for seens to expiate, for it is not to be paid till the war is over.

Mr. Moreehead inquired if the honorable senator considered the present proposition as confining the President, in the disbursement of the money, to the purposes to be specified in the treaty, as the resolution of the last session did?

Mr. Cass said that his understanding of the proposition, was that the money was not to be paid until a treaty was agreed upon. The payment was not to precede the treaty, but to follow it.

Mr. Webster, (rising.) Will the honorable senator allow me—

Mr. Cass. I will hear you with pleasure, but I cannot answer any more questions. I have said that no money is to be paid until a treaty is ratified.

Mr. Webster. I was merely going to remark that that is the very turning point.

Mr. Cass. I will sit down and hear the honorable senator, but he must not ask me any questions. If he does, I shall not answer them till I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. Webster resumed his seat.

The whole proposition results from the peculiar condition of Mexico. Her government is ephemeral. Its members are born in the morning and die in the evening. Administrations succeed one another, like the scenes of a theatre rather than the events of life, and still less of events in the life of a nation. The rulers do not dare to do justice in such a case as this. It might cost them their places, to which they hold on as tenaciously as though their tenure were a secure one. There is a strong excitement in that country against us. Nothing shows this more distinctly than the scene which lately passed there, when their President swore that the nation would never yield one inch of its territory, nor make peace with the invader till his foot was off its soil. A dangerous resolution to be thus publicly proclaimed, and one more easily proclaimed than kept. The sublime and the ridiculous may so easily touch, that nations should be chary in such exhibitions which may belong to the domain of the one or of the other as subsequent circumstances stamp their character. Whatever judgment, however, history may pronounce upon this ceremony in Mexico it is significant enough of the disposition of the people towards us. Hence the difficulty of the government is increased, and hence the necessity of their strengthening themselves. Their revenues are drying up. They are always in debt in all their departments, civil and military. By a prompt payment into their treasury upon the ratification of a treaty, the government will be enabled to satisfy the most pressing demands, and thus to do an act of justice at home to counteract any ill effects of an act of justice abroad. And this is the very point of the whole matter. We may thus tempt them to do right, while so many other strong circumstances tempt them to do wrong. As to the application of this money, after it reaches the treasury of Mexico, it is no question of ours, any more than was the application of the consideration money paid to France and Spain for the purchase of Louisiana and Florida. We cannot follow it, and it must take its fate with the other resources of the country. It has one advantage, however, and that is its publicity. If the silver or gold were carried by wagons to the palace of the government, the transaction could have no more publicity than it has now. And this throws upon the authorities a much graver responsibility than do the ordinary payment, and one less likely to be abused. If all this is bribery, I am fully prepared to take my share of it. If it is bribery, let the honest governments of Europe make the most of it.

As to the comparison instituted by the honorable senator from Maryland, between this act and an attempt of the Mexican government to bribe General Taylor, it certainly gives me very little trouble. We have nothing to do with Santa Anna, as the general of an army. We deal with the government of Mexico. The very authority that makes the treaty is the authority to which the payment is to be made. If General Taylor were the American government, and had the power to cede away a portion of the American territory, the analogy would then exist in fact, and now it exists but in fancy. And this obvious consideration answers all the objection presented by the senator, when he expresses such an apprehension that the money would slip from our fingers before we secured a consideration. Not a dollar is to be paid till the treaty is ratified and the country thus made ours.

Passing now, sir, from the consideration of this subject to the course before us, I would observe that there are but three plans of operation by which we can escape from the difficulties of our position.

The first, is an abandonment of the war, and an inglorious return to our own country.

The second, is the establishment of a line over such a portion of the enemy's territory, as we think proper, and holding the country on this side of it without any further military operations.

The third, is a vigorous prosecution of the war, agreeably to the public expectation, and the experience of the world.

As to the first, sir, I do not place it in the category of things proposed; and I cast it from me with contempt.

The second, sir, is a very different proposition, supported by high names, civil and military, and it was yesterday presented to us with great power of argument and beauty of illustration by the distinguished senator from South Carolina. I shall state as succinctly as I can the reasons which induce me to consider this as an expedient, not to say an impossible proposition.

A plan of operations, seeking to hold a portion of a country properly guarded by fortresses and furnished with the necessary lines of communication, and seeking to do this without publicly announcing the nature of the plan and the determination to adhere to it, is one thing. An attempt to occupy another portion of country, open, unfortified, with no natural boundaries, and penetrable in all directions, and publicly proclaiming this system as an invariable one, not to be departed from, is another and quite a different thing.

From the Gulf of Mexico, following the boundaries of the provinces now in our possession, to the Pacific ocean, is but little short of 1000 miles. Far the greater portion of it is open, and much of it unoccupied. Instead of any lines of communication, natural or artificial, where it must necessarily be crossed, it may be crossed anywhere. It is a mere paper line—a descriptive one. For hundreds of miles on each side of a great part of such a line, the country is the same pastoral one rather than possessed by nomadic tribes, and affording subsistence and shelter to the beasts of the earth. If you assume such a boundary, you necessarily place yourself upon the defensive. You must establish troops along it, and these must be scattered occupying different positions. Your enemy then acts in masses, while you act in detachments. He attacks you, and is discomfited, he falls back behind his impenetrable barrier. A snake clutched by an eagle is one of the emblems of the armorial bearings of Mexico. If this plan of fighting to an air line is adopted, the proud bird will soon be powerless, and the reptile will coil itself up to strike at his leisure and its pleasure. In such a state of offensive defensive warfare, the enemy chooses his time when you least expect him or are least able to resist him. He gains your rear and cuts off your convoys and supplies, and thus reduces you to weakness and distress. He strikes you in a period of sickness, in a climate to which you are unaccustomed, and whose alternations do not affect him. You cannot pursue him into his country, for the moment, the very instant you do that, you confess the folly of your plan and abandon it forever. If you cross your boundary you must cross it to hold on, and then you have a new boundary, or a series of other works, or of unlimited operations. If you do not cross to hold on, what will you do? Your very object in crossing is to chastise the enemy; and you must pursue him to his fortresses and capture them, if he has any, or you must fight him in the open field and disperse him. I repeat, if you do not do this, you will be well punished for your temerity; you will certainly at the retiring enemy, take off your hats and say: Good bye gentlemen; we will wait till you come back again. The riches of Croesus would melt away before such a system of fighting and fighting. The laurels of Napoleon would wither for seens to expiate, for it is not to be paid till the war is over.

No public sentiment the dishonor. There is but one such campaign, sir, recorded in all history, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, true or fabulous, and that is the campaign of Sisyphus. It was an eternal one. Sanction the plan proposed and yours will be eternal too. This stone will not be rolled to the top of the mountain. It would be a never ending, ever renewing war. The distinguished senator from South Carolina thinks that four regiments and three fortresses along this line, and one regiment and a few small vessels for California, "would be ample for its defence." The line as described by himself, is this: "Beginning at the mouth of the Rio del Norte, and continuing up the Paso del Norte, or southern boundary of New Mexico, which nearly coincide, and then due west to the Gulf of California, striking it according to the maps before us, nearly at its head."

Here, sir, is a line across the continent from the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of California; and this line is to be so protected by five regiments, three fortresses and a few small vessels, as to be impervious to the rancheros and other light troops of Mexico—the best and most indefatigable horsemen, perhaps, in the world. I have enumerated, in these means of defence, proposed to us, a few small vessels, because they form a part of the project of the senator. How they are to be employed in defending any part of the line, as I do not understand I will not attempt to explain.* If the soldiers were stationed equidistant upon this boundary, they would probably be a mile apart. It seems to me, sir, and I say it with respect, that we might as well attempt to blockade the coast of Europe by stationing a ship in the middle of the Atlantic. As to the Rio Grande it is no defence line at all. Rivers, when best guarded, are found to afford very insufficient protection. But in the great country south and west of us, yet in a state of nature, or slowly emerging from it, streams are entitled to little consideration in defensive operations. Who is there that has passed his life in the west, and has not crossed them a hundred times by swimming, in canoes, upon logs, upon rafts and upon horses? Is it to be supposed that an active Mexican, accustomed to the woods from his infancy, would hesitate to dash into a stream, and cross it, almost as readily, as if it were unbroken ground?

But, sir, there is another consideration, not to be overlooked. How could you keep your citizens on this side of your imaginary line? The honorable senator tells us, their spirit of adventure can hardly be restrained in time of peace, and that there is always danger, that they will push into Mexican provinces. But in time of war, even of a new kind of war like this, they would feel that the enemy's country was open to them, and their incursions would keep up a continued state of hostilities.

The senator says that offensive wars look to the subjugation of a country. I do not thus read the history of the world nor the history of nations. I consider offensive wars as necessary means for the attainment of certain just objects. Our war with England in 1812 was an offensive one; but no American, even in his wildest dreams, ever expected to subjugate that country. Our object was to compel her to do justice, by injuring her wherever we could. History is filled with instances of offensive wars, undertaken with expectation of subjugation. Indeed, were it not otherwise, there would be few offensive was, unless those undertaken by very large states against very small ones. If it were so, perhaps the world would be better off. The question, however, is not before me, and I shall not travel out of my way to meet it.

The senator says we have gained 600,000 square miles, and who would continue the war to secure the acknowledgement of Mexico. But, sir, it is that very acknowledgement which is to give us the country. Until the right which cession gives is added to the right derived from conquest, we make no acquisition of territory. We are still at war. It is the very act of acknowledgement which constitutes peace, and without which there can be no peace.

The honorable senator speaks of certainty. How far he requires it in the anticipation of events, I do not know. These are his words: "Is there any certainty—for I go on certainties now, more than probabilities—can any gentleman see any certainty of Mexico yielding to our terms, even supposing the first campaign should find us in the city of Mexico?"

I, for one, can see no such certainty, sir. Indeed it does not belong to man to see it. There is scarcely any other certainty in this life than that it will be terminated, and soon terminated by death. Almost all is doubtful around us, especially in the operations of war. We are told from the highest authority, always that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, and every day's experience confirms the truth of the proposition. Some of the most splendid achievements in war, from Salamis to Monterey, have been gained under apparently adverse circumstances, and against great disparity of force. If we are only to fight when victory is certain we shall never fight at all. The slightest circumstances which human sagacity could not foresee, nor human power overcome, have many times decided the destiny of nations. The senator also has submitted many sound observations respecting the diversity of characters of races and of institutions, which exist between us and Mexico, and he deprecates with equal zeal and justice the union of the Mexican people and ours. I fully agree, sir, in all that. It would be deplorable amalgamation. No such evil will happen to us in our day. We do not want the people of Mexico either as citizens or subjects. All we want is a portion of territory, which they nominally hold, generally uninhabited, or where inhabited at all, sparsely so, and with a population which would soon recede or identify itself with ours. The senator says, speaking of Mexico, "what are you to do with the territory?" I answer nothing at all as a permanent acquisition. "Will you," says the senator, "incorporate it in your union?" Certainly not. We shall hold it as a means of procuring an honorable peace. And such a peace it may be made to procure for us.

Some of the remarks of the honorable senator I regretted to hear. Those which cast doubts upon the power of this country to prosecute this war to an honorable conclusion—such a conclusion, indeed, as will alone be satisfactory to the American people. I am not going, Mr President, to subject these views to any severity of investigation, I should do it with reluctance in any case, and I could not do it in this. My unfeigned respect for the distinguished senator would prohibit it.—While I claim for myself, and yield to others the most unlimited range of discussion; and while I do not call in question the truth of the sentiment uttered during the last war, that a public man has a right to speak to his country, though he may be heard by the enemy, still there are discretionary limits, which it seems to me it were better not to pass.

Every word that is spoken here is heard upon the plateau of Mexico. Legislative discussions, with open doors, are in this age of progress, discussions before the world. As we watch the indications of public opinion in Mexico, and seek them in the journals of the day, the same universal messengers carry back all that we are saying, and doing, and proposing. Far be it from me to question the conduct or the motives of any honorable senator. I believe that every member of that body is actuated by as pure intentions as I am myself. But I suggest, is it prudent to say here that it is uncertain whether we shall be able to reach the city of Mexico during this campaign, and that if we do not, she will be encouraged, and we discouraged, she fortified, and we irresolute?—Is it prudent to say, that there are doubts whether we can raise the means for another, more costly, and at a greater distance? To say, that the spirit of volunteering is gone? To say, that for a third campaign there will be no longer resources in treasury notes? Exhausted, perhaps, more than exhausted by this single campaign? To ask, if we can borrow? If we can lay taxes? What taxes, &c? To ask, if we can collect them in certain States that are embarrassed, and to answer no! To inquire, if there will be sufficient unanimity and zeal in the prosecution of the war, to warrant the belief that Congress would grant the necessary supplies?

These are irksome inquiries to me, Mr. President, and I shall not pursue them. If all this is so, we are already unfaithful to the trust transmitted to us, purchased by the exertion and blood of our fathers, and left as a precious legacy for those who are to come after us. The lofty position of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, his reputation—a European one, in fact—his great services, and his pure character, give extraordinary weight to all the sentiments he utters, and the deeper, therefore, is my regret. If these apprehensions are well founded, there is another point of application for the epigrammatick remark of a French statesman, speaking of us in the earlier period of our history, who said, "*If such is the youth* of that republic, what *will be its old age?*" Sir, it will have no old age.

The eyes of Europe are upon us. Nothing worse can happen to us than to stop ingloriously. This is our last resource. We have, then, but to prosecute this war, as other wars are prosecuted by other nations. We have but to discard dangerous experiments, and to hold on to the experience of the world. We must breast ourselves to the shock. We must continue our occupation of Mexico, and push the invasion still farther. We must do as other people have done—we must attack and disperse her armies, take possession of her towns and capture her fortresses. There seems to be some analogy between the cities of Paris and Mexico. Both are the native seats of revolutions. Both exert a preponderating influence over their respective countries. I have no right to give an authoritative opinion respecting the expediency of a demonstration upon the capital. Still, I do not hesitate to say that I think it would be a wise and probably decisive measure. It would disperse the government, and weaken, if not break, its hold upon public opinion. It would divert the revenues from them to us. And in addition to this resource, I agree fully with the honorable senator from Missouri in opinion, that we should call contributions to our aid in defraying our military expenses. It is a legitimate means of support for hostile armies. It belongs to the present age, and not exclusively to the past. During all the wars of Europe in our time, almost the first thing the commander of a foreign army does on entering an enemy's town, is to convene the magistrates and make requisitions upon them for bread, meat, wine, forage, and such other supplies as fire wanted.—Mexican, accustomed to the woods from his infancy, would hesitate to dash into a stream, and cross it, almost as readily, as if it were unbroken ground?

But, sir, there is another consideration, not to be overlooked. How could you keep your citizens on this side of your imaginary line? The honorable senator tells us, their spirit of adventure can hardly be restrained in time of peace, and that there is always danger, that they will push into Mexican provinces. But in time of war, even of a new kind of war like this, they would feel that the enemy's country was open to them, and their incursions would keep up a continued state of hostilities.

The senator says that offensive wars look to the subjugation of a country. I do not thus read the history of the world nor the history of nations. I consider offensive wars as necessary means for the attainment of certain just objects. Our war with England in 1812 was an offensive one; but no American, even in his wildest dreams, ever expected to subjugate that country. Our object was to compel her to do justice, by injuring her wherever we could. History is filled with instances of offensive wars, undertaken with expectation of subjugation. Indeed, were it not otherwise, there would be few offensive was, unless those undertaken by very large states against very small ones. If it were so, perhaps the world would be better off. The question, however, is not before me, and I shall not travel out of my way to meet it.

The senator says we have gained 600,000 square miles, and who would continue the war to secure the acknowledgement of Mexico. But, sir, it is that very acknowledgement which is to give us the country. Until the right which cession gives is added to the right derived from conquest, we make no acquisition of territory. We are still at war. It is the very act of acknowledgement which constitutes peace, and without which there can be no peace.

The honorable senator speaks of certainty. How far he requires it in the anticipation of events, I do not know. These are his words: "Is there any certainty—for I go on certainties now, more than probabilities—can any gentleman see any certainty of Mexico yielding to our terms, even supposing the first campaign should find us in the city of Mexico?"

I, for one, can see no such certainty, sir. Indeed it does not belong to man to see it. There is scarcely any other certainty in this life than that it will be terminated, and soon terminated by death. Almost all is doubtful around us, especially in the operations of war. We are told from the highest authority, always that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, and every day's experience confirms the truth of the proposition. Some of the most splendid achievements in war, from Salamis to Monterey, have been gained under apparently adverse circumstances, and against great disparity of force. If we are only to fight when victory is certain we shall never fight at all. The slightest circumstances which human sagacity could not foresee, nor human power overcome, have many times decided the destiny of nations. The senator also has submitted many sound observations respecting the diversity of characters of races and of institutions, which exist between us and Mexico, and he deprecates with equal zeal and justice the union of the Mexican people and ours. I fully agree, sir, in all that. It would be deplorable amalgamation. No such evil will happen to us in our day. We do not want the people of Mexico either as citizens or subjects. All we want is a portion of territory, which they nominally hold, generally uninhabited, or where inhabited at all, sparsely so, and with a population which would soon recede or identify itself with ours. The senator says, speaking of Mexico, "what are you to do with the territory?" I answer nothing at all as a permanent acquisition. "Will you," says the senator, "incorporate it in your union?" Certainly not. We shall hold it as a means of procuring an honorable peace. And such a peace it may be made to procure for us.

Some of the remarks of the honorable senator I regretted to hear. Those which cast doubts upon the power of this country to prosecute this war to an honorable conclusion—such a conclusion, indeed, as will alone be satisfactory to the American people. I am not going, Mr President, to subject these views to any severity of investigation, I should do it with reluctance in any case, and I could not do it in this. My unfeigned respect for the distinguished senator would prohibit it.—While I claim for myself, and yield to others the most unlimited range of discussion; and while I do not call in question the truth of the sentiment uttered during the last war, that a public man has a right to speak to his country, though he may be heard by the enemy, still there are discretionary limits, which it seems to me it were better not to pass.

Every word that is spoken here is heard upon the plateau of Mexico. Legislative discussions, with open doors, are in this age of progress, discussions before the world. As we watch the indications of public opinion in Mexico, and seek them in the journals of the day, the same universal messengers carry back all that we are saying, and doing, and proposing. Far be it from me to question the conduct or the motives of any honorable senator. I believe that every member of that body is actuated by as pure intentions as I am myself. But I suggest, is it prudent to say here that it is uncertain whether we shall be able to reach the city of Mexico during this campaign, and that if we do not, she will be encouraged, and we discouraged, she fortified, and we irresolute?—Is it prudent to say, that there are doubts whether we can raise the means for another, more costly, and at a greater distance? To say, that the spirit of volunteering is gone? To say, that for a third campaign there will be no longer resources in treasury notes? Exhausted, perhaps, more than exhausted by this single campaign? To ask, if we can borrow? If we can lay taxes? What taxes, &c? To ask, if we can collect them in certain States that are embarrassed, and to answer no! To inquire, if there will be sufficient unanimity and zeal in the prosecution of the war, to warrant the belief that Congress would grant the necessary supplies?

These are irksome inquiries to me, Mr. President, and I shall not pursue them. If all this is so, we are already unfaithful to the trust transmitted to us, purchased by the exertion and blood of our fathers, and left as a precious legacy for those who are to come after us. The lofty position of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, his reputation—a European one, in fact—his great services, and his pure character, give extraordinary weight to all the sentiments he utters, and the deeper, therefore, is my regret. If these apprehensions are well founded, there is another point of application for the epigrammatick remark of a French statesman, speaking of us in the earlier period of our history, who said, "*If such is the youth* of that republic, what *will be its old age?*" Sir, it will have no old age.

The eyes of Europe are upon us. Nothing worse can happen to us than to stop ingloriously. This is our last resource. We have, then, but to prosecute this war, as other wars are prosecuted by other nations. We have but to discard dangerous experiments, and to hold on to the experience of the world. We must breast ourselves to the shock. We must continue our occupation of Mexico, and push the invasion still farther. We must do as other people have done—we must attack and disperse her armies, take possession of her towns and capture her fortresses. There seems to be some analogy between the cities of Paris and Mexico. Both are the native seats of revolutions. Both exert a preponderating influence over their respective countries. I have no right to give an authoritative opinion respecting the expediency of a demonstration upon the capital. Still, I do not hesitate to say that I think it would be a wise and probably decisive measure. It would disperse the government, and weaken, if not break, its hold upon public opinion. It would divert the revenues from them to us. And in addition to this resource, I agree fully with the honorable senator from Missouri in opinion, that we should call contributions to our aid in defraying our military expenses. It is a legitimate means of support for hostile armies. It belongs to the present age, and not exclusively to the past. During all the wars of Europe in our time, almost the first thing the commander of a foreign army does on entering an enemy's town, is to convene the magistrates and make requisitions upon them for bread, meat, wine, forage, and such other supplies as fire wanted.—Mexican, accustomed to the woods from his infancy, would hesitate to dash into a stream, and cross it, almost as readily, as if it were unbroken ground?

But, sir, there is another consideration, not to be overlooked. How could you keep your citizens on this side of your imaginary line? The honorable senator tells us, their spirit of adventure can hardly be restrained in time of peace, and that there is always danger, that they will push into Mexican provinces. But in time of war, even of a new kind of war like this, they would feel that the enemy's country was open to them, and their incursions would keep up a continued state of hostilities.

The senator says that offensive wars look to the subjugation of a country. I do not thus read the history of the world nor the history of nations. I consider offensive wars as necessary means for the attainment of certain just objects. Our war with England in 1812 was an offensive one; but no American, even in his wildest dreams, ever expected to subjugate that country. Our object was to compel her to do justice, by injuring her wherever we could. History is filled with instances of offensive wars, undertaken with expectation of subjugation. Indeed, were it not otherwise, there would be few offensive was, unless those undertaken by very large states against very small ones. If it were so, perhaps the world would be better off. The question, however, is not before me, and I shall not travel out of my way to meet it.

The senator says we have gained 600,000 square miles, and who would continue the war to secure the acknowledgement of Mexico. But, sir, it is that very acknowledgement which is to give us the country. Until the right which cession gives is added to the right derived from conquest, we make no acquisition of territory. We are still at war. It is the very act of acknowledgement which constitutes peace, and without which there can be no peace.

The honorable senator speaks of certainty. How far he requires it in the anticipation of events, I do not know. These are his words: "Is there any certainty—for I go on certainties now, more than probabilities—can any gentleman see any certainty of Mexico yielding to our terms, even supposing the first campaign should find us in the city of Mexico?"

I, for one, can see no such certainty, sir. Indeed it does not belong to man to see it. There is scarcely any other certainty in this life than that it will be terminated, and soon terminated by death. Almost all is doubtful around us, especially in the operations of war. We are told from the highest authority, always that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, and every day's experience confirms the truth of the proposition. Some of the most splendid achievements in war, from Salamis to Monterey, have been gained under apparently adverse circumstances, and against great disparity of force. If we are only to fight when victory is certain we shall never fight at all. The slightest circumstances which human sagacity could not foresee, nor human power overcome, have many times decided the destiny of nations. The senator also has submitted many sound observations respecting the diversity of characters of races and of institutions, which exist between us and Mexico, and he deprecates with equal zeal and justice the union of the Mexican people and ours. I fully agree, sir, in all that. It would be deplorable amalgamation. No such evil will happen to us in our day. We do not want the people of Mexico either as citizens or subjects. All we want is a portion of territory, which they