PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Gentlemen of the Senate
and House of Representatives:

The past has been an eventful year, and will be hereafter referred to as a marked epoch in the history of the world. While we have been happily preserved from the calamities of war, our domestic prosperity has not been entirely uninterrupted. The crops, in portions of the country, have been nearly cut off. Disease has prevailed to a greater extent than usual, and the sacrifice of human life, through casualties of several kinds, is without a parallel. But the pestilence has swept by, and restored exhilarating invigorates the absent to their homes and the returns of business to its ordinary channels. If the earth has rewarded the labor of her husbandman less bountifully than in preceding seasons, it has left him with abundance for domestic wants, and a large surplus for exportation. The general powers of Europe and America. Accordingly, a preponderation, which seemed to be the rule that free ships make free goods, except contraband articles, but also the free enslaved men, that neutral property, not other than contraband, though on board enemy's ships, shall be exempt from confiscation, has submitted to the general government to those of Europe and America.

Russia acted promptly in this matter, and a convention was concluded between that country and the United States, providing for the observance of the principles enumerated, not only as between themselves, but also as between them and all other nations, which shall enter into like stipulations. None of the other powers have as yet taken final action on the subject. I am not aware, however, that any objection to the proposed stipulation has been made; but on the contrary, they are acknowledged to be essential to the safety of commerce, and especially to that of a vast and rapidly growing country like ours, which must depend upon its commerce and navigation for the successful employment of its surplus products. Our present peace and friendly intercourse with all nations.

On this theory of this Government, so early adopted and steadily pursued, of avoiding all entangling alliances, has hitherto attended to many complications, from which it would otherwise have become involved. Notwithstanding this our clearly defined and established position relative to our country, in every instance honorably obtained, or would feel themselves justified in engaging our advances in the event of aggression or to a passion for political predominance.

Our foreign commerce has reached a magnitude and extent nearly equal to that of the first maritime power of the earth, and exercising a portion of the influence which that power previously excluded, in the courts of the States. Over this great interest, in which not only our commercial classes of citizens at least indirectly are concerned, it is the duty of the executive and legislative branches of the government to exercise a careful supervision, and, where necessary, to provide for its protection. The policy which I have had in view, in regard to this interest, embraces in future as well as its present security.

Long experience has shown that, in general, the principal powers of Europe are engaged in war, the rights of neutral nations are endangered. This considerations led, in the beginning of the war of our independence, to the formation of the celebrated confederacy of armed neutrality. A primary object of which was to maintain the doctrine, that free ships make free goods, except in the case of articles contraband of war; a doctrine which, from the very commencement of our national being, has been a cherished idea of the statesmen of this country.

At one period or another, every maritime power has, by some solemn treaty stipulation, recognized that principle; and it might have been hoped that it would come to be universally received and respected as a rule of international law. But the refusal of one power prevented this, and in the next great war which ensued, that of the French Revolution, it failed to be respected among the belligerent states of Europe. Now the tables are turned, the principle generally admitted to be a sound and salutary one; so much so, that, at the commencement of the existing war, Great Britain and France announced their purpose to observe it for the present; not, however, as a recognized international right, but a mere concession for the time being.

The co-operation, however, of those two powerful maritime nations in the interest of neutral rights, appeared to me to afford an occasion, inviting and justifying, on the part of the United States, a renewed effort to make the doctrine in question a principal of international, by means of special conventions between the several powers of Europe and America. Accordingly, a proposition, to that effect, was done but little way in carrying out that principle, which equally requires that such private property should not be sei-zed or molested by national ships of war. Should the leading powers of Europe concur in proposing, as a rule of international law, to exempt private property upon the ocean, from seizure by public armed cruisers, as well as by privateers, the United States will readily meet them upon that broad ground.

Since the adjournment of Congress, the ratifications of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, relative to coast fisheries, and to reciprocal trade with the British North American provinces, have been exchanged and some of its anticipated advantages are already enjoyed by us, although its full execution was to abide certain acts of legislation not yet fully performed. So soon as it was ratified, Great Britain opened to our commerce the free navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and to our fisheries an unrestricted access to the shores and bays, from which they had been previously excluded, on the coasts of the British North American provinces; in return for which, she asked for the introduction, free of duty, into the ports of the United States, of a few of the articles caught on the same coast by British fishermen. This being the consideration, stipulated in the treaty, for privileges of the highest importance and value to the United States, which were thus voluntarily yielded to before it became effective, the request seemed to me to be a reasonable one; but it was not considered by them as within the authority to suspend our laws imposing duties upon all foreign fish. In the meantime, the Government has instituted a negotiation for ascertaining the duties paid or secured by bonds on fish caught on the coasts of the British provinces, and imported in our markets by British subjects, after the fishing-grounds had been made fully accessible to the citizens of the United States. I recommend to your favorable consideration a proposition, which will be submitted to you, for allowing a refund of the duties and cancel the bonds thus received. The provinces of Canada and New Brunswick have also anticipated the full operation of the treaty, by legislative arrangements respectively, to admit, free of duty, the products of the United States mentioned in, the free list of the treaty; and an arrangement, similar to that regarding British fish, has been made for duties now chargeable on the products of those provinces enumerated in the same free list, and introduced therefrom into the United States; a proposition for reciprocity which will, in my judgment, be it should be more equitable in your favorable consideration.

There is difference of opinion between the United States and Great Britain, as to the boundary line at the Territory of Washington adjoining the British possessions on the Pacific, which has already led to difficulties on the part of the citizens and local authorities of the two governments. I recommend that provision be made for a commission, to be joined by a commissioner on the part of her Britannic Majesty, for the purpose of running and establishing the line in controversy. Certain stipulations of the third and fourth articles of the treaty concluded by the United States and Great Britain in 1846, regarding possessory rights of the Hudson's Bay Company and property of the Puget's Sound Agricultural Company, have given rise to serious differences, and it is important that the question should be decided. I have reason to believe that an arrangement can be made on just terms, for the extinguishment of the rights in question, embracing, also, the right of the Hudson's Bay Company to the navigation of the river Columbia; and I therefore suggest to your consideration the propriety of making a contingent appropriation for that purpose.

France was the early and efficient ally of the United States in their struggle for independence. From that time to the present, the most friendly relations, and, colonies, cordial relations of friendship have existed between the governments and people of the two countries. Such sentiments, cherished alike by both nations, have led to extensive social and commercial intercourse, which has not been interrupted or checked by any casual event of an apparently unsatisfactory character. The King of France, at the first moment of his accession to the throne, was the first sovereign to recognize the new republic. His successor, the present Emperor, has been equally kind and friendly. Napoleon, the first, in his time, and Napoleon, the third, in his, have been made the objects of the same unfriendly animadversions in this country, and both have received the same evidences of friendship from the people of the United States. Their respective governments have been equally friendly. Whatever differences of opinion between the United States and France, it was confidently hoped and expected that they would be settled in a manner honorable to both parties. Such was the state of things when the existing war between Russia and the Western powers broke out. Each of the belligerents has declared its intention to respect the rights of neutrals, and to observe the rules of international law, as recognized by the United States, in the treaty with Russia, and by the principles which it has proclaimed. Under such circumstances, it could hardly have been expected that those among them, which have, without a single exception, been the aggressors, and absorbed ancient kingdoms, planted their standards upon every continent, and now possess a great part of the habitable islands of every ocean as their appropriate domain, would look with unfriendly sentiments on the acquisitions of this country, in every instance honorably obtained, or would feel themselves justified in engaging our advances in the event of aggression or to a passion for political predominance.

Another large accession to the territory of the United States, without resort on our part to our mercantile marine, the means of transporting to inflict injury upon our enemy would be tenfold greater than ours to retaliate. We could not exercise our country from the unequal contest. Against such an enemy, unless we at once deportment from our present peaceful policy, and become a party to the war. Nor would this country be better situated in war with one of the secondary naval powers. Though the naval disparity would be less, the greater extent and more exposed condition of our wide spread commerce would give any of those a like advantage over us.

The proposition to enter into engagements as foreign resort to privateers in case this country should be forced into hostility should be rejected with promptness and decision. It will never be resorted to by the people, and the welfare of other nations. Our military establishment, in time of peace, is adapted to various exterior defences, and to preserve order among the aboriginal tribes within the limits of the Union. Our naval force is adapted to the use of the protection of our citizens abroad, and of our commerce, diffused, as it is, over all the seas of the globe. The army and navy of the United States, being essentially pacific in their character, stands prepared to repel invasion by the whole force of their respective people, and provides no permanent means of foreign aggression. These considerations should at all times be borne in mind, and disposed to encroach on the rights, or endanger the security, of other.

Some European governments have regarded, with disquieting concern, the territorial expansion of the United States. This rapid growth has resulted from the legitimate exercise of sovereign rights, belonging alike to all nations, and by many liberally exercised. Under such circumstances, it could hardly have been expected that those among them, which have, within a comparatively short period, founded and absorbed ancient kingdoms, planted their standards upon every continent, and now possess a great part of the habitable islands of every ocean as their appropriate domain, would look with unfriendly sentiments on the acquisitions of this country, in every instance honorably obtained, or would feel themselves justified in engaging our advances in the event of aggression or to a passion for political predominance.

Another large accession to the territory of the United States, without resort on our part to our mercantile marine, the means of transporting to inflict injury upon our enemy would be tenfold greater than ours to retaliate. We could not exercise our country from the unequal contest. Against such an enemy, unless we at once deportment from our present peaceful policy, and become a party to the war. Nor would this country be better situated in war with one of the secondary naval powers. Though the naval disparity would be less, the greater extent and more exposed condition of our wide spread commerce would give any of those a like advantage over us.

The proposition to enter into engagements to