

of San Jacinto; by which they conquered their independence. Considering the numbers engaged on the respective sides, history does not record a more brilliant achievement. Santa Anna himself was among the captives.

In the month of May, 1836 Santa Anna acknowledged, by a treaty with the Texan authorities, in the most solemn form, the full, entire, and perfect independence of the republic of Texas. It is true he was then a prisoner of war, but it is equally true that he failed to reconquer Texas, and had met with signal defeat; that his authority had not been revoked and that by virtue of his treaty he obtained his personal release. By its hostilities were suspended, and the army which had invaded Texas under his command returned in pursuance of this arrangement unmolested, to Mexico.

From the day that the battle of San Jacinto was fought until the present hour, Mexico has never possessed the power to reconquer Texas.—In the language of the Secretary of State of the United States, in a despatch to our minister in Mexico, under date of the 8th of July, 1842, 'Mexico may have chosen to consider, and may still choose to consider Texas as having been at all times since 1836, and as still continuing a rebellious province; but the world has been obliged to take a very different view of the matter. From the time of the battle of San Jacinto, in April, 1836, to the present moment, Texas has exhibited the external signs of national independence as Mexico herself find with quite as much stability of government. Practically free and independent, acknowledged as a political sovereignty by the principal Powers of the world no hostile foot finding rest within her territory for six or seven years, and Mexico herself refraining for all that period from any further attempt to re-establish her own authority, over that territory, it cannot but be surprising to find Mr. de Bocuagra' (the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico,) 'complaining that for that whole period citizens of the U. S. or its government, have been favoring the rebels, of Texas, and supplying them with vessels, ammunition, and money, as if the war for the reduction of the province of Texas had been constantly prosecuted by Mexico, and her success prevented by these influences from abroad.' In the same despatch the Secretary of State affirms that since 1837 the United States have regarded Texas as an independent sovereignty as much as Mexico; and that trade and commerce with citizens of a government at war with Mexico cannot on that account, be regarded as an intercourse by which assistance and succor are given to Mexican rebels. The whole current of Mr. de Bocuagra's remarks runs in the same direction as if the independence of Texas had not been acknowledged. It has been acknowledged—It was acknowledged in 1837 against the remonstrance and protest of Mexico; and most of the acts of any importance, of which Mr. de Bocuagra complains, flow necessarily from that recognition. He speaks of Texas as still being an integral part of the territory of the Mexican republic; but he cannot but understand that the United States do not so regard it. The real complaint of Mexico, therefore, is, in substance, neither more nor less than a complaint against the recognition of Texas independence. It may be thought rather late to repeat that complaint, and not quite just to confine it to the United States, to the exemption of England, France and Belgium, unless the United States, having been the first to acknowledge the independence of Mexico herself, are to be blamed for setting an example for the recognition of that of Texas. And he added, that 'the constitution, public treaties, and laws obligate the President to regard Texas as an independent State and its territory as no part of Mexico.'—Texas had been an independent State with an organized government, defying the power of Mexico to overthrow or reconquer her for more than ten years before Mexico commenced the present war against the United States. Texas had given such evidence to the world of her ability to maintain her separate existence as an independent nation, that she had been formally recognized as

such, not only by the United States but by several of the principal powers of Europe. These powers had entered into treaties of amity, commerce, and navigation with her.—They had received and accredited her ministers and other diplomatic agents of their respective courts, and they had commissioned ministers and diplomatic agents on their part to the government of Texas. If Mexico, notwithstanding all this, and her utter inability to subdue or reconquer Texas, will stubbornly refused to recognize her as an independent nation she was none the less so on that account. Mexico herself had been recognized as an independent nation by the U. States and other powers, many years before Spain, of which, before her revolution she had been a colony, would agree to recognize her as such; and yet Mexico was at the time, in the estimation of the civilized world, and in fact, not the less an independent power because Spain still claimed her a colony. If Spain had continued until the present period to assert that Mexico was one of her colonies in rebellion against her, his would not have made her so, or changed the fact of her independent existence. Texas at the period of her annexation to the United States, bore the same relation to Mexico that Mexico had borne to Spain for many years before Spain acknowledged her independence, with this important difference—that before the annexation of Texas to the United States was consummated, Mexico herself, by formal act of her government, had acknowledged the independence of Texas as a nation. It is true, that in the act of recognition she has prescribed a condition which she no power or authority to impose, that Texas should not annex herself to any other Power; but this could not detract in any degree from the recognition which Mexico then made of her actual independence. Upon this plain statement of facts, it is absurd for Mexico to allege as a pretext for commencing hostilities against the United States, that Texas is still a part of her territory.

But there are those who, conceding all this to be true, assume the ground that the true western boundary of Texas is the Nueces, instead of the Rio Grande, and that, therefore, in marching our army to the east bank of the latter river, we passed the Texas line, and invaded the territory of Mexico. A simple statement of facts, known to exist, will conclusively refute such an assumption. Texas, as ceded to the United by France in 1803, has been always claimed as extending west to the Rio Grande, or Rio Bravo. This fact is established by the authority of our most eminent statesmen at a period when the question was as well, if not better understood than it is at present. During Mr. Jefferson's administration, Messrs. Monroe and Pickney, who had been sent on a special mission to Madrid, charged, among other things, with the adjustment of boundary between the two countries, in a note addressed to the Spanish minister of Foreign Affairs, under date of the 28th of January, 1805, assert that the boundaries of Louisiana, as ceded to the U. S. by France, 'are the river of Perdido on the east, and the river Bravo on the west,' and they add, that 'the facts and principles which justify this conclusion are so satisfactory to our government as to convince it that the United States have not a better right to the island of New Orleans, under the reservation referred to, than they have to the whole district of territory which is above described.

Down to the conclusion of the Florida treaty in February, 1819, by which this territory was ceded to Spain, the United States asserted and maintained their territorial rights to this extent. In the month of June, 1818, during Mr. Monroe's administration, information having been received that a number of foreign adventurers had landed at Galveston, with the avowed purpose of forming a settlement in that vicinity, a special messenger was dispatched by the government of the United States, with instructions from the Secretary of State, to warn them to desist, should they be found there for any other place north of the Rio Bravo, and within the territory claimed by the United States.

He was instructed, should they be found in the country north of that river, to make known to them 'the surprise with which the President has seen possession taken, without authority from the United States, of a place within their territorial limits, and upon which no lawful settlement can be made without their sanction.' He was instructed to call upon them to 'show under what national authority they profess to act,' and to give them 'due warning that the place is within the United States, who will suffer no permanent settlement to be made there, under any authority other than their own.' As late as the 8th of July, 1842, the Secretary of State of the United States, in a note addressed to our minister in Mexico, maintains that, by the Florida treaty of 1819 the territory as far west as the Rio Grande was confirmed to Spain. In it he states that, by the treaty of February, 1819, between the United States and Spain, the Sabine was adopted as the line of boundary between the two Powers. Up to that period, no considerable colonization had been effected in Texas; but the territory between the Sabine and the Rio Grande being confirmed to Spain by the treaty, applications were made to that Power for grants of land, and such grants, or permissions of settlements, were in fact made by the Spanish authorities in favor of citizens of the United States proposing to emigrate to Texas in numerous families, before the declaration of independence by Mexico.

The Texas which was ceded to Spain by the Florida treaty of 1819, embraced all the country now claimed by the State of Texas between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. The republic of Texas always claimed this river as her western boundary, and in her treaty made with Santa Anna in May, 1836, he recognized it as such.—By the consent of Texas which Texas adopted in March, 1836, senatorial and representatival districts were organized extending west of the Nueces. The Congress of Texas, on the 19th of December, 1836, passed 'An act to define the boundaries of the republic of Texas; in which they declared the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source to be their boundary, and by the said act they declared their civil and political jurisdiction over the country up to that boundary.

During a period of more than nine years which intervened between the adoption of her constitution and her annexation as one of the States of our Union, Texas asserted and exercised many acts of sovereignty and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants west of the Nueces. She organized and defined the limits of counties extending to the Rio Grande. She established courts of justice and extended her judicial system over the territory. She established a custom-house, and collected duties, and also post offices and post roads, in it. She established a land office, and issued numerous grants of land, within its limits. A Senator and Representative residing in it were elected to the Congress of the republic, and served as such before the act of annexation took place. In both the Congress and Convention of Texas, which gave their assent to the terms of annexation, to the United States proposed by our Congress, were representatives residing west of the Nueces, who took part in the act of annexation itself. This was the Texas which, by the act of our Congress of the 28th of December, 1845, was admitted as one of the States of our Union. That the Congress of the U. States admitted the State of Texas which they admitted into the Union to extend beyond the Nueces is apparent from the fact that on the 31st of December, 1845, only two days after the act of admission, they passed a law to establish a collection district in the State of Texas; by which they created a port of delivery at Corpus Christi situated west of the Nueces, and being the most western of which the Texas custom-house, under the laws of that republic, had been located, and directed a surveyor to collect the revenue should be appointed for that port by the President, by and with advice and consent of the Senate. A surveyor was accordingly nominated and confirmed by the Senate, and has been ever since in the performance of his duties. All these acts of the republic of Texas, and of our Congress, preceded the orders for the advance of our army to the east bank of the Rio Grande. Subsequently, Congress passed an act establishing certain post routes

extending west of the Nueces. The country west of that river now constitutes a part of one of the Congressional districts of Texas, and is represented in the House of Representatives. The Senators from that State were chosen by a legislature in which the country west of that river was represented. In view of all these facts, it is difficult to conceive upon what ground it can be maintained that, in occupying the country west of the Nueces with our army, with a view solely to its security and defence, we invaded the territory of Mexico. But it would have been still more difficult to justify the Executive whose duty it is to see that the laws be faithfully executed. If in the face of all the proceedings, both of the Congress of Texas and of the United States, he had assumed the responsibility of yielding up the territory west of the Nueces to Mexico, or refusing to protect and defend this territory and its inhabitants, including Corpus Christi as well as the remainder of Texas, against the three tened Mexican invasion.

But Mexico herself has never placed the war which she has waged upon the ground that our army occupied the intermediate territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande her rebelled pretension that Texas was not in fact an independent State, but a rebellious province, was obstinately preserved in; and her avowed purpose in commencing a war with the United States was to reconquer Texas, and restore Mexican authority over the whole territory not to the Nueces only, but to the Sabine. In view of the proclaimed measures of Mexico to this effect, I deemed it my duty, as a means of precaution and defence, to order our army to occupy a position on our frontiers as a military post, from which our troops could best resist and repel any attempted invasion which Mexico might make.

The President here goes on to detail the movement of our troops in Western Texas in 1845 and the early part of 1846, with the reasons therefor, and refers to Mr. Sill's mission to Mexico and his successful mission to that Power, &c. We are sorry that want of room compels us to omit these interesting details. He goes on then to speak of the campaign and the conduct of our troops in the following handsome manner.

Upon the commencement of hostilities by Mexico against the United States, the indignant spirit of the nation was at once aroused. Congress promptly responded to the expectations of the country, and by the act of the thirteenth of May last, re-recognized the fact that war existed, by the act of Mexico, between the United States and that republic, and granted the means necessary for its rigorous prosecution. Being involved in a war thus commenced by Mexico, and for the justice of which on our part we may confidently appeal to the whole world, I resolved to prosecute it with the utmost vigor. Accordingly, the posts of Mexico on the Gulf and on the Pacific have been placed under blockade, and her territory invaded at several important points.—The reports from the Department of War and the Navy will inform you more in detail of the measures adopted in the emergency in which our country was placed and of the gratifying results which have been accomplished.

The various columns of the army have performed their duty under great disadvantages, with the most distinguished skill and courage.—The victories of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, and of Monterey, won against greatly superior numbers, and against most decided advantages in other respects on the part of the enemy, were brilliant in their execution, and evince our brave officers and soldiers in the grandest thanks of their country. The nation deplores the loss of the brave officers and men who have gallantly fallen while vindicating and defending their country's rights and honor.

It is a subject of pride and satisfaction that our volunteer citizen-soldiers, who so promptly responded to their country's call with an experience of the discipline of a camp of only a few weeks, have borne their part in the hard fought battle of Monterey with a constancy and courage equal to that of veteran troops, and worthy of the highest admiration. The privations of long marches through the enemy's country, and through a wilderness, have been borne with a noble firmness. By rapid movements the province of New Mexico, with Santa Fe its capital, has been captured without bloodshed. The navy has co-operated with the army, and rendered important services; if not so brilliant, it is because the enemy had no force to meet them on their element, and because of the defenses which nature has interposed in the difficulties of the navigation on the Mexican coast. Our squadron in the Pacific, with the co-operation of a gallant officer of the army, and a small force hastily collected in that distant country, have acquired bloodless possession of the California, and the American flag has been

raised at every important point in that province.

I congratulate you on the success which has thus attended our military and naval operations. In less than seven months after Mexico commenced hostilities, at a time selected by herself, we have taken possession of many of her principal ports, driven back and pursued her invading army, and acquired military possession of the Mexican provinces of New Mexico, New Leon, Coahuila, Tamaulipas, and the California territory larger in extent than that embraced in the original thirteen States of the Union, inhabited by a considerable population, and much of it more than a thousand miles from the points at which we had to collect our forces and commence our movements. By the blockade, the import and export trade of the enemy has been cut off.

Well may the American people be proud of the energy and gallantry of our regular and volunteer officers and soldiers. The events of these few months afford a gratifying proof that our country can, in an emergency, confidently rely for the maintenance of her honor, and the defence of her rights, on an effective force, ready at all times to unite to repel the aggressions of the enemy. And though such a force may be for the time expensive, it is in the end economical, as the ability to command and economize the necessity of employing a large standing army in time of peace, and proves that our people love their institutions, and are ever ready to defend and protect them.

[The President next alludes to our friendly efforts to negotiate since the war began, and the answer of Mexico to it; and after making several other points, and making some recommendations to Congress, closes his masterly exposition upon the subject of the war. He proves fully that it is, upon our part, a just war; and that the conduct of the administration has been irreproachable and patriotic.

He refers to the financial affairs of the government and shows that since the 4th of March, 1845, up to the 10th of December, 1846, the whole amount of the public debt created is only a little over six millions of dollars including the war expenses. The message concludes as follows.]

The balance in the treasury on the first of July last exceeded nine millions of dollars, notwithstanding considerable expenditures had been made for the war during the months of May and June preceding. For the war, the whole public debt could and would have been extinguished within a short period; and it was a part of my settled policy to do so, and thus relieve the people from its burden, and place the government in a position which would enable it to reduce the public expenditures to the economical standard which is most consistent with the general welfare, and the progressive progress of our institutions.

Among our just causes of complaint against Mexico, arising out of her refusal to treat for peace, as well before as since the war so unjustly commenced on her part, are the extraordinary expenditures in which we have been involved, justice to our own people will make it proper that Mexico should be held responsible for these expenditures.

Economy in the public expenditures is at all times a high duty which all public functionaries of the government owe to the people. This duty becomes the more imperative in a period of war, when large and extraordinary expenditures become unavoidable. During the existence of the war with Mexico all our resources should be husbanded, and no appropriation made except such as are absolutely necessary for its vigorous prosecution and the due administration of the government. Objects of appropriation, which in peace may be deemed useful or proper, but which are not indispensable for the public service, may when the country is engaged in a foreign war, be well postponed to a future period. By the observance of this policy at your present session, large amounts may be saved to the treasury, and be applied to objects of pressing and urgent necessity, and thus the creation of a corresponding amount of public debt may be avoided.

It is not meant to recommend that the ordinary and necessary appropriations for the support of government should be withheld; but it is well known that at every session of Congress appropriations are proposed for numerous objects which may or may not be made without materially affecting the public interest; and these it is recommended should not be granted.

The act passed at your last session relieving the duties on imports not having gone into operation until the first of the present month, there has not been time for its practical effect upon the revenue, and the business of the country, to be developed. It is not doubted, however, that the just policy which it adopts will add largely to our foreign trade, and promote the general prosperity. Although it cannot be certainly

foreseen what amount of revenue it will yield, it is estimated that it will exceed that produced by the act of 1842, when it superseded.—The leading principles established by it are, to levy the taxes with a view to raise revenue, and to impose them upon the articles imported according to their actual value.

The act of 1842, by the excessive rates of duty which it imposed on many articles other than those excluded from importation, or greatly reduced the amount imported, and thus diminished instead of producing revenue. If it the taxes were imposed not for the legitimate purpose of raising revenue, but to afford advantages to favored classes, at the expense of a large majority of their fellow-citizens. Those employed in agriculture, mechanical pursuits, commerce, and navigation, were compelled to contribute from their substance to swell the profits and overgrown wealth of the comparatively few who had invested their capital in manufactures. The taxes were not levied in proportion to the value of the articles upon which they were imposed; but, widely departing from this just rule, the higher taxes were, in many cases levied upon articles of luxury and high price, and the heavier taxes on those of necessity and low price, consumed by the great mass of the people. It was a system the inevitable effect of which was to relieve favored classes and the wealthy few from contributing their just proportion for the support of government, and to lay the burden on the labor of the many, engaged in other pursuits than manufactures.

A system so unequal and unjust has been superseded by the existing law, which imposes duties not for the benefit or injury of classes or pursuits, but distributes, and, as far as practicable, equalizes the public burdens among all classes and occupations. The favored classes, who under the unequal and unjust system which has been repealed, had heretofore realized large profits and many of them amassed large fortunes, at the expense of the many who have been made tributary to them, will have no reason to complain if they shall be required to bear their just proportion of the taxes necessary for the support of government. So far from it, it will be perceived, by an examination of the existing law, that discriminations in the rates of duty imposed, within the revenue principal, have been retained in their favor. The incidental aid against foreign competition which they still enjoy gives them an advantage which no other pursuits possess; but of this none others will complain, because the duties levied are necessary for revenue. These revenue duties including freights and charges, which the importer must pay before he can come in competition with the home manufacturer in our markets, amount, on nearly all our leading branches of manufacture, to more than one-third of the value of the imported article, and in some cases to almost one-half its value. With such advantages, it is not doubted that our domestic manufactures will continue to prosper, realizing in well conducted establishments even greater profits than can be derived from any other regular business. Indeed so far from respecting the protection of even incidental revenue duties, our manufacturers in several leading branches are extending their business, giving evidence of great ingenuity and skill, and of their ability to compete, with increased prospect of success, for the open market of the world. Domestic manufactures, to the value of several millions of dollars, which cannot find a market at home are annually exported to foreign countries.

With such rates of duty as those established by the existing law, the system will probably be permanent; and capitalists, who have made or shall hereafter make, their investments in manufactures, will know upon what to rely. The country will be satisfied with these rates, because the advantages which the manufacturers still enjoy, result necessarily from the collection of revenue for the support of government. High protective duties, from their unjust operation upon the masses of the people, cannot fail to give rise to extensive dissatisfaction and complaint; and to constant efforts to change or repeal them rendering all investments in manufactures uncertain and precarious. Lower and more permanent rates of duty at the same time that they will yield to the manufacturer fair and remunerating profits, will secure him against the danger of frequent changes in the system, which cannot fail to ruinously affect his interests.

Simultaneously with the relaxation of the restrictive policy by the United States, Great Britain, from whose example we derived the system, has relaxed hers. She has modified her corn laws, and reduced other duties to moderate revenue rates. After ages of experience, the statesmen of that country have been constrained by a