

in danger of undergoing a great change from its true theory." Sir, if he had been forty years in these halls, instead of the tened field, he could not have more thoroughly understood the true theory of this Government and its actual inevitable tendency, as now administered. It is evident he has, in the silent hours allowed him in the camp, by the watch fire in the night, or amid the intervals of battle and military service, deeply studied the genius of our Government and its practical administration.

Sir, it would consume more time than is necessary for my purpose, to show how often the will of the people, expressed by the Representatives in Congress, has been defeated by the iron will of a President, and especially by the exercise of his monarchic negative on the laws. In the language of a distinguished statesman, "the extreme medicine of the Constitution has become our daily food." Every man who remembers the history of the last twenty years, will bear me witness that in this respect, the modern democracy have drifted to a returnless distance from the old landmarks of Republicanism. The Executive prerogative is no longer the object of attack, but its advocates have been the unceasing assailants of the rights of the people, and of the popular branch of the Government. "The power of the crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." He has broken down the power of the people to improve their rivers and harbors—dictated a new and untried system of currency in despite of their expressed opinion—and even gone so far as to deny the right of Congress to pay a private claim to an American citizen. I refer to the claim for French spoliation on our commerce to 1800, for the liquidation of which a bill passed both houses of Congress two years ago—a bill the principles of which he never understood—a bill, to which it is palpable, he never gave a weeks attention in his life, though Congress passed it, after having it held under consideration for a period of nearly fifty years. The Government has ceased to be a government of the People, and has become a government of one man. Power says Junius, is continually stealing from the many to the few, and I may add, and from the few to one. The one man-power is the subject of unceasing eulogy among some of the advocates of the Baltimore Convention platform, and one of the delegates lately made a speech to show its superiority in concentrating all responsibility in one head instead of dividing it among many, thus frankly avowing his preference for the monarchial over to the republican principle.

We must arrest this tendency to monarchy if we intend to remain a Republic. When you talk to me about Whig principles, tariffs, the currency, internal improvements, land bills, and public economy, I tell you that, although I am a Whig, I have always been a Whig, and expect to die a Whig, yet I hold that, in comparison with the great principle now at issue between Lewis Cass and Zachary Taylor, the other principles of any party ever yet known in this country sink into insignificance. I am called upon, in the election of Zachary Taylor, to vindicate the great right of man to self-government, and the right of the people, through their Representatives in Congress, to make laws. I am called upon to deny the right of the President of the United States to assume the position of a legislator; and whenever the day shall come that his right to legislate shall be acknowledged, that moment the republican character of our government utterly ceases to exist. You may call it what you please—you may style the man at the head of the government a President, as Bonaparte was, in the first instance, styled the first Consul, and afterwards Emperor of the Republic—but to all intents and purposes your Republic is at an end—it becomes a Monarchy—an elective Monarchy—the meanest and most despicable form in which that kind of government can exist.

Here then is the principle upon which I make issue with the honorable gentleman from Mississippi in the approaching Presidential campaign. I mean to stand by Gen. Taylor as the representative of the right of man to self-government. I mean to support him because he has boldly and nobly proclaimed himself, before the country, as the champion of this great principle, that the majority should govern. In all those cases where the fathers of the Republic intended that the veto power should be applied, he declares that he will exercise it. In all cases where a bill passed by Congress, he has manifested unconstitutionality or has been passed in haste and without due consideration, he will be prepared to apply the veto. He is ready to apply it to sustain the Union of these States against any dangerous infraction of the Constitution. But he will permit the people of the country to govern themselves. He will suffer the Representatives of the people and the States, in these halls, to make the laws. He will not set himself up as an essential part of the legislative power of the nation. He will, when he reaches the Presidential chair, stand by the great principles avowed on this subject by Madison and his compatriots of 1787, and utterly repudiate the kingly maxim practised upon in the present day. "Sic volo, sic jubeo, sic stant." I propose to look a little further into this subject. I desire to educate and the people of the country to understand what kind of government was sought to be established by those who introduced the veto power into the Constitution of the United States, and the kindred principles which actuated them. In Madison's papers, we find a copy of the Constitution which Colonel Hamilton, the father of the veto, intended to propose. Here are three of its provisions:—

"ARTICLE I.—Sec. 1. The legislative power shall be vested in two distinct bodies of men, one to be called the Assembly, the other the Senate, subject to the negative hereinafter mentioned.

"ARTICLE IV.—Sec. 10. The President shall have a right to negative all bills, resolutions, or acts of the two Houses of the legislature about to be passed into laws.

"ARTICLE III.—Sec. 6. The Senators shall hold their places during good behavior, removable only by conviction, on impeachment, for some crime or misdemeanor."

Here are the principles of the Government which the author of the veto power intended to introduce. It is manifest that the mind of the author of the veto power was at an infinite distance from the opinions of those who made the Constitution. It is evident that he intended to

establish a Senate for life, and to make the President a part of the legislative power. But the Executive practice in these days (all of which seems to be fully approved by Gen. Cass,) is not merely *sic volo, sic jubeo, sic stant*. He now assumes the initiative in addition to the veto power. He not only recommends, but dictates to Congress. His opinions are daily quoted in debate here, and control our legislation. It has been four days since an attempt was made by the Senators from Kentucky and Tennessee, (Mr. Underwood and Mr. Bell,) to remove the obstruction in the river Ohio at Cumberland island. Everybody here seemed to think it right to remove it—but it was known and said that the President would veto the bill which contained it, and the improvement fell. So the navigation of the Ohio must be obstructed till Taylor can put it all right, by allowing Congress to make laws. We have now not a single river or harbor bill before Congress not one measure for internal improvement.—Why? Because we all know it is idle to waste our time in passing them, as the President has publicly avowed his resolution to veto them all. The will of the people is nothing. All men here look only to the will of the President. He is the fountain of favor. Now in the British House, under a limited monarchy, the independence of Parliament is secured by a rule which makes it their *privilege* for any member, to state in debate what is the will of the king; and it is perfectly true, as Col. Hamilton stated in the Convention of 1787, that no king of England has dared to exercise the veto power since the English revolution produced by the Whigs of 1688, one hundred and sixty years ago. Why? Because the exercise of a power so despotic, which wholly denies to the people the right of self-government, would, even in that limited monarchy, have cost an English monarch his head.

Queen Victoria would not keep the throne a week under one of our Presidential votes. We have the name of a Republic, but *stat nominis umbra*—it stands but the shadow of a name.—I first came into Congress nearly twenty years ago, and I have since been an attentive observer of men and things here, though one of the humblest of the actors on this theatre, where men with loud professions of Democracy on their lips, cherish the most despotic principles in their hearts; and I now say that the monarchic tendency has every year been growing stronger, that many of our legislative acts of the most important character are drafted at the Executive Departments to suit the will of the Executive, and that Congress has degenerated, under the Democratic Presidents, till it is little better than the register of the edicts of an Emperor. It is but a few months since a member who has served in Congress thirty years, (Mr. Webster,) declared in his place, that he had never known a President set his heart on any great measure which he did not force through Congress.

Why is this? Let a Democratic report, made to drive the younger Adams from power '22 years ago, make the answer. The veteran member from Missouri, (Mr. Benton,) in his report on Executive patronage, May 4, 1826, after enumerating the monstrous extent of the power of that patronage, says:

"The whole of this great power will centre in the President. The King of England is the fountain of honor; the President of the United States is the source of patronage. He presides over the entire system of Federal appointments, jobs, and contracts. He has 'power' over the 'support' of individuals who administer the system. He makes and unmakes them. He chooses from the circle of his friends and supporters, and may dismiss them, and upon all the principles of human action, will dismiss them, as he pleases, as they expectant of his favor. His spirit will animate their actions in all the elections to State and Federal offices.—There may be exceptions, but the truth of a general rule is proved by the exception. The intended check and control of the Senate, without new constitutional or statutory provisions, will cease to operate. Patronage will penetrate this body, subdue its capacity of resistance, chain to the ear of power, and enable the President to run as easily, and much more securely, with than without, the nominal check of the Senate. If the President was himself the officer of the People, elected by them, and responsible to them, there would be less danger from the concentration of all power in his hands; but it is the business of statesmen to act upon things as they are, and not as they would wish them to be.—We must then look forward to the time when the *public revenue will be doctored*, when the *civil and military officers of the Federal Government will be quadrupled*; when its influence over individuals will be multiplied to an *indefinite extent*; when the nomination by the President can carry any man through the Senate, and his recommendation can carry any measure through the two Houses of Congress; when the principle of public action will be open and avowed, *the President wants as votes as he wishes, and he will give me the office I wish for*."

What will this be but the Government of one man? and what is the Government of one man but a monarchy? Names are nothing. The nature of a thing is in its substance, and the name soon accommodates itself to the substance. The first Roman Emperor was styled Emperor of the Republic, and the last French Emperor took the same title; and their respective countries were just as essentially monarchic before and after the assumption of these titles. It cannot be denied, or dissembled, but that this Federal Government gravitates to the same point, &c. "Those who make the President must support him. Their political fate becomes identified, and they must stand or fall together. Right or wrong, they must support him: and if he is made contrary to the will of the People he must be supported not only by votes and speeches, but by arms."

I proceed now to answer some of the interrogatories proposed by the honorable Senator from Mississippi; and, first, in relation to the tariff. He asks me whether General Taylor is in favor of the tariff. I answer that General Taylor has expressly declared in his letter to Captain Allison, that he will, on that subject, submit to the will of the people. If they, by their Representatives in Congress, choose to pass a protective tariff law, he will not veto it. If they choose to retain the free trade law of 1816, he will not interfere with it. The Senator asks what is my position in regard to this question? I answer that I am a Whig, and as a true friend of the American tariff of 1812, and the principles of that tariff, I am perfectly content with the President of the United States who will permit the will of the Representatives of the people and of the States to become the law of the land. The honorable gentleman referred to a letter of mine, written in 1846, to my political friends in Delaware, in which I avowed myself to be what I have always felt proud to declare myself—a friend to the protection of American industry, and the tariff of 1812. It was a letter written, not as he says, for a Presidential election, but for a State election—on the eve of it. I shall never abandon it—but I refer to the principle it avows.

The honorable Senator inquired if there was a man on this side of the chamber who was in favor of that tariff of 1812? I AM, and I think all on my side of the chamber concur with me. But I do not desire General Taylor to force any tariff upon the country, by the exercise of Executive power. He is willing, on that great question, to let the vote of the people govern; and no man, be he from the North or from the South, who desires to curb the expression of the

people on this subject, can justly call himself a true Republican. It is because Gen. Taylor, on this, as on other great questions, stands on Republican ground, that we desire his election. He occupies precisely the platform on which Mr. Jefferson placed himself in the origin of parties in this country. He is in favor of strengthening the popular branch of the Government, by expanding to the great dividing landmark between parties in 1793. But, alas! your modern democracy has been driven by its office-holding leaders to a very different position from that occupied by Mr. Jefferson. It now stands as the advocate, the prop and support of kingly power. Here Mr. C. addressed himself to the Democratic side of the chamber.—You defend all its encroachments. You spurn the rights of the country and of Congress. You decide that the President shall put down the will of the people; and you have nominated a man who stands solemnly pledged before the Convention, by his letter of acceptance of your nomination, to veto the will of the people, when expressed through their representatives, on all great leading questions, in any other way than as a mere faction, which the minority was suffered to control, and which took only one night to consider all the great questions of public policy, your candidate is pledged to veto the vote of the people, should even nine-tenths of them decide upon a repeal of the tariff of 1816, and a re-enactment of that of 1842. Now, on this ground, is there any honorable free-trade man who will hesitate to give his support to Gen. Taylor? Every honest citizen support Gen. Taylor; and no one can accuse them of apostatizing from any political party to which they may have been attached.—I, as a Whig, can unite with my fellow citizens of the Democratic party in support of General Taylor, and all I ask of them is to be Republican in heart, and allow the will of the people to govern; for that is the great principle laid by him in the history of the Government, and infinitely above all other questions of party ever made in this country. I cherish no unkind feelings toward the distinguished gentleman whom the democratic convention nominated. I have always entertained for him the highest regard, on account of the excellence of his private character. But I am now reviewing his public acts—not his private life. I have shown that instead of occupying republican ground, he stands precisely in the position occupied by Col. Hamilton and Mr. Wilson in the Federal Convention—pledged to sustain the ultra exercise of Executive power, and to veto and put down the will of the nation on every subject upon which an irresponsible convention, had had the effrontery to dictate their arbitrary dogmas to the American people. These men have thus set themselves up above the Constitution, and usurped the legislative power. They look to control the appointments of the Magistrate, and like the Polish Diet, virtually to elect a monarch to ride over and rule an abused and insulted people.

Which, then, is the Republican party? Is it the great National Party, composed of Democrats, naturalized citizens, native citizens, and Whigs—patriotic men of all parties—who now constitute the great Taylor party of the country? That is the true Republican party; opposed to the arbitrary tendency of the Government, to its administration; anxious to avert its progress to monarchy;—and unless the principles of that party be sustained, the liberties of the country must, sooner or later, fall beneath the axe which has been laid to their root by the proceedings of the interested and intriguing faction, which has by turns muzzled, cajoled, and trampled upon the rights of the modern Democracy. When, then, I call upon any man to support Gen. Taylor, I do not ask that he should be a Whig, or a Democrat, but a Republican—a Republican not merely by profession, but a Republican in heart and deed.

The party leaders in the Convention that introduced this two-thirds rule, and thus cheated itself, refusing to allow the majority to govern, have felt already the consequences of their conduct. This rule was introduced as a permanent principle of the Democratic party in the convention which elected Mr. Taylor, and which nominated Mr. Van Buren and his friends. He went into the Convention, expecting that the will of the majority would be allowed to control its action; and he received the votes of a decided majority of that convention. But the politicians—those jugglers who understood the game which was to be played—so contrived it, that a majority could not control the action of the convention. They declared Southern men by the pretext, that as the North was in danger, and that the protection of slavery was in danger, and thus procured their aid to establish the rule, that a vote of two-thirds was necessary to nominate the candidate. They thus rejected Mr. Van Buren; and what has been the result? This political magician, as he was called, has applied his magic touch to your party, and lo! it is crumbling into dust! It is prostrate beneath his feet at this moment! The splendid party fabric, the Regency palace which by his wizard art, he erected in the Empire State, has vanished like the morning mist, or one of those dreamy mansions of which we read in Eastern tales, at the touch of one of the geni. The vengeance of the man who was thus defrauded and defeated, equals that of Mæzappa, the Prince of Baginburners.

"For if we do but mark the hour,
There never yet was human power,
That could evade, if unforgiven,
The patient sword and vigil long,
Or him who sits upon a throne."

I say, gentlemen who now vainly attempt to uphold a tottering fabric of pro-secession, aggressive, and retrogressive Democracy, that on the day on which you established that principle, and overthrew the fundamental principle of all republican government, your destiny was sealed! From that hour your doom was irrevocably fixed. Nothing could or can save you from the fate that awaits you. Nothing can save any party in this country, that shall dare to establish such an unprincipled rule. The people may be humbugged for a time; but when they have been allowed opportunity for reflection, and see a fraud perpetrated, repeated, and enjoined as a principle, by which the right of the majority is denied, the shackles of party can bind them no longer. They imbibed this sacred principle from their fathers—they were taught it by their mothers amidst the first lessons of their infancy, and that which without their Government would be converted into a government of pronouncements, and could not exist an hour. Whig as I am, and ever have been, I have no hesitation in declaring, that if the Whig party were to assemble in convention to-morrow, and adopt such a principle, I would leave them the moment I could address a letter to the public.

The Senator also inquires what will Gen. Taylor do in reference to the Sub-Treasury of the Bank. I answer, that Gen. Taylor has pledged himself, in the Allison letter, to let the people govern. If they want this miserable Sub-Treasury scheme, they will keep it. If they wish to repeal it, he will interpose no veto upon the exercise of their will. On the other hand, how stands Lewis Cass, the Champion of the Democracy? He has pledged to retain the Sub-Treasury, in spite of the will of the people. If three fifths of the people should come here demanding the repeal of the Sub-Treasury law, Mr. Cass would be bound to trample upon that will. Which, then, is the Republican?—Which the true Democrat?

Mr. FOOTE.—Will the gentleman bear with me while I submit another question. Does he

regard the veto power as a conservative one, to be retained, or as one to be struck out of the constitution? If it be retained, should it not be exercised?

Mr. CLAYTON.—I am very glad that the honorable gentleman has put this interrogatory. I hold the veto power to be a conservative power in the Constitution. I do not seek, nor do the friends of Gen. Taylor seek, to strike it from the Constitution. We regard it as the fathers of the Republic did—as a conservative power to enable the Executive to defend itself, and to be exercised precisely within the limitations laid down by Madison and his associates. Gen. Taylor specifies the causes for which he will apply the veto.

I do not return to the consideration of the question of the currency and the National Bank, at which point the Senator interrupted the course of my remarks. And I recur to the Bank question particularly, that this matter may be put to rest, so far as in my power, now and forever.—I do not know a man who supports Gen. Taylor, that entertains the most remote idea of bringing the question of a national bank before the Congress of the Union. I do not know a Whig on this side of the chamber, or any where else, who cherishes any idea of reviving that question. The gentlemen on the other side will rattle the dry bones of the old Bank of the United States in our faces, but they will, by doing so, only frighten the men of their own party who voted in Congress for, and carried that bank charter; and they will attempt in vain to ride any longer on their old political hobby as an anti-bank party. Whatever opinions we may have in regard to that great question, we have all resolved that we will never revive it. If the Democratic party want a Bank of the United States let them move it. We on this side of the chamber know that a National Bank could be of no value to the country, unless sustained by the will of both the great parties of the country. I am free to declare here the part which I took in reference to this question. I voted for the bank in 1832; and I have since that time, as far as you, Mr. President, (Mr. Dallas,) were the chairman of the committee that reported the bill. I only followed that lead. We passed the bank bill with your assistance, your argument, influence, and vote; and your aid extended much farther; for when Gen. Jackson vetoed it, you and I concurred in voting against the veto! I will never deny the faith that is in me. As I thought then, I think now. And the day will come when your denials will be under the pressure of die will ever start that question again. The question of a national bank should be and will be allowed to remain at rest, until men of all parties shall seek to establish, and resolve to sustain it, by a unanimity which shall place it above the reach of the demagogues who will seek to destroy it.

I am asked what Gen. Taylor will do in regard to internal improvements. That is the most important subject, and I think I have already answered this question. It deserves the patient and most deliberate consideration of every American citizen. But on this question, the course of the bold, manly old patriot, is as plain as the sun at noonday. He will leave this question also to the will of the people. If their Representatives in Congress choose to pass a bill for internal improvements, he will not interpose his veto on the law. Nor will he write any messages for the purpose of manufacturing internal improvement men, or tariff men, or any other kind of politicians. He will not enter on a career of propagandism. He does not intend to get up a hot-bed for tariffs or internal improvements, but knowing that nothing can prosper which does not rest in the confidence and affections of the people, he will refer these questions to the original sources of power, and will sustain them all with inflexible firmness so long as the people will permit them to stand. He does not mean to push things to extremes. His administration will neither be aggressive or retrogressive; but he will adapt his progress to the mighty energies and capabilities of a nation unexampled in the history of the world for its advance in arts, as well as arms, in agriculture, commerce, and manufactures.

Now, on this great question, let me ask, where stands Gen. Taylor? I must now, in my turn, put the honorable Senator from Mississippi to the professional, and ask him to illuminate my path, by shedding a little light upon this subject. I find that the resolution passed by the Baltimore Convention in favor of the exercise of the veto power, contained these words:—

"Resolved, That we are decidedly opposed to taking from the President the veto power, &c., which has saved the American people from the corrupt and tyrannical domination of the Bank of the United States, and from a corrupting system of general internal improvements."

From a statement of Mr. Yancey, a member of the Convention, it appears that these words about internal improvements, which were originally reported by the committee appointed to draft the "Baltimore platform," were objected to, for the reason thus stated by Mr. Yancey in a speech in the city of Charleston, South Carolina, on the 24th June last, exposing the deeds of this convention:—

"Amongst other things he instanced, as evidence of its unsoundness as an exponent of Democratic views, its refusal to adopt its resolutions avowing its principles and the platform upon which it designed to place its nomination. And now mark the result, he continued:—At the nomination was made a committee was raised to report a series of resolutions. Mr. Yancey said that the committee met on the evening of its appointment and sat until ten o'clock. Before it adjourned the resolution in relation to the veto power had been amended so as to show its happy effect in saving the country 'from a corrupting system of general improvements.' It was unanimously agreed to as sound Democratic doctrine and as a deserved compliment to Mr. Polk. When the committee met next morning the first proposition made was to reconsider that amendment and strike it out. It inquired why? It had been admitted to be good Democratic doctrine the night before. The answer was, 'Gen. Cass voted against that veto of Mr. Polk, and if we put this in we will condemn our nominee.'"

"These virtuous politicians—these trust-worthy representatives of democracy—had discovered by morning that the avowal of a truth would put an error to blush; and the praise of a patriot would be the condemnation of a political heretic."

"The vote was not re-considered, but it was, as Mr. Yancey firmly believed, because it was too barefaced even for that body; and if the idea that Cass had voted against Mr. Polk's veto had been thought of before the amendment was adopted, it never would have graced those resolutions." As a result, it indeed became a thorn in the side of the nominee."

Now I ask the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, will Gen. Cass veto a general system of internal improvements?

Mr. FOOTE.—I am not prepared to state further than this: that it is my own opinion which I am almost certain is well-founded, that General Cass is opposed to any general system of internal improvements, and that he would veto a bill in favor of such a system. But, as I said the other day, my own impression has always been, that a liberal system of internal improvements, within the Constitution, would certainly meet the support of Gen. Cass. Now, if I have answered the question satisfactorily, I would ask the Senator whether Gen. Taylor will withhold his veto, in case of his election, to any bill for internal improvements that may happen to pass both houses of Congress?

Mr. CLAYTON.—However vague the answer, or the question addressed to me, I reply promptly, that I do not believe the case will occur of the deliberate and well considered passage of a bill for any internal improvement by both houses of Congress, which ought to be condemned by the American Executive. General Taylor, while pledged to abide by the will of the people, is also free to restrain any hasty or inconsiderate legislation.

Mr. FOOTE.—The question is not whether such or such a case can occur, but whether Gen. Taylor would so act in certain circumstances.

Mr. CLAYTON.—It is impossible for me to state my opinion as to what the action of Gen. Taylor, in a given case, might be, unless the case be stated with precision. You might suppose a case in which Congress, having gone raving mad, would vote twenty-five millions out of the Treasury, when there were not five millions in it, and ask me whether General Taylor would veto that. But I am now looking as a practical man, to the cases which are likely to occur, and I have not the most distant idea that any circumstances will actually exist in which Gen. Taylor will apply the veto to a bill for internal improvements. But how stands the candidate of the other side of the chamber with respect to this question? Perhaps, as his pathway still remains obscured, the honorable gentleman from Illinois can inform me. Does he believe that Gen. Cass will veto a bill for internal improvements?

Mr. BREESE.—I will answer the Senator very frankly. I did not believe that Gen. Cass would veto such a bill. I would not vote for him. Mr. CLAYTON.—I believe that the gentleman from Illinois, as well as Gen. Cass, twice voted for the river and harbor bill, and against the veto on that bill. Does he believe that such a bill would meet with a veto from President Cass?

Mr. BREESE.—I do not suppose that it would. And with all frankness, permit me to say, that as I understand the principles of the Democratic party, a palpable distinction has always been made between a general system of internal improvements and mere appropriations out of the Treasury for the improvement of rivers and harbors.—Reasonable appropriations for the latter purpose would no doubt receive the sanction of Gen. Cass and the democratic party. But appropriations for a vast and expensive system of internal improvements, I hope never will receive the sanction of either.

Mr. CLAYTON.—We see from these vague answers how difficult it is to ascertain what Gen. Cass does or does not mean about these times. I know that he has voted in favor of every internal improvement bill, and against every veto of them. Now I have always heretofore looked to a man's acts in order to ascertain what he meant to do; and I have hitherto regarded Gen. Cass as a high ultra internal improvement man. I have always believed that he could go further on that subject than I could myself, and that there were some things besides Mexico which I found very difficult to take, which he swallowed with great ease. It is apparent that there are two Senators who have very different views of Gen. Cass's opinions upon the subject of internal improvement. I am apprehensive that we are to understand Gen. Cass one way in one part of the Union, and differently in another part. He was called upon by one of his friends at Cleveland, (Mr. Wood,) to state his opinions on this subject, but we were informed that the "noise and confusion" were so great that he could not make any reply, although he was able to tell the audience, very audibly, much about his early history, and how he had risen from comparative obscurity to become the candidate of the great democratic party. I am very much afraid Mr. President, that the "noise and confusion" will continue throughout the campaign, and that we shall never be able to ascertain the opinions of Gen. Cass upon this important subject. He has written a letter approving of the whole Baltimore platform. Let me read a portion of that platform which was not expunged:

"Resolved, That the Constitution does not confer upon the general government, the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvement.

It seems, then, from the light before us, that the Baltimore Convention held that the Government could not carry on a "general system of internal improvement," but the honorable member from Illinois says it may carry on a particular system, such as that indicated by the river and harbor bill which met Mr. Polk's veto. That was first reported by a committee to the Convention as a "corrupting system," as Mr. Polk was, in that report, complimented for his veto upon it. But as Mr. Cass had voted for the corrupting system, against Mr. Polk's veto, and it was held necessary, as Mr. Yancey proves, not to "condemn the nominee," the compliment was struck out, and this veto was not approved. Then, to mystify the whole matter still further, another resolution passed, "that the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844, which elected Jas. K. Polk, have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union." But the most amusing part of the whole platform is the distinction of the Senator from Illinois between a "general system of improvement," and "mere appropriations for rivers and harbors."—The Senator from Mississippi holds the river and harbor bill unconstitutional, but still sustains Mr. Cass, who, he says is for a liberal system. The Senator from Illinois is for the river and harbor bill. Mr. Polk is against that bill, and also against the liberal system, *totò coelo*. Yet all are on the platform. Each is orthodox. Is it not clear, therefore, that the platform to which General Cass pledged himself by his letter of acceptance of the Baltimore nomination requires another explanation from himself?

Mr. FOOTE.—Gen. Cass, in his letter accepting the nomination of the Baltimore convention, stated that that letter closed his profession of faith.

Mr. CLAYTON.—I remember that very well. In that letter, after endorsing this unintelligible platform of the Democratic convention, he adds, that he will say no more. He closed the door, became "General mum," and accordingly, in his answer to Mr. Wood, of Cleveland, he refused to throw any more light on the subject. It is palpable that his position is equivocal, and differently understood in different sections of the Union, and that the platform itself is a mere humbug.

The honorable gentleman asked me what were the sentiments of Gen. Taylor in regard to the Mexican war. I think he will find an answer perfectly satisfactory.

ry in the Allison letter. There General Taylor announces a great principle of vast importance to this country. He avows himself opposed to the doctrine of annexation by conquest. He is opposed to war, when the honor of the country does not demand it, and in favor of peace as the general policy of the nation. He congratulates the country upon the successful termination of the Mexican war. But he distinctly announces his own principle, conservative and glorious as it is—one on which we will go into the canvass this fall—that he will oppose all war for the purposes of conquest.

Mr. FOOTE.—The Senator seems to have glided past my interrogatory. The question was, did Gen. Taylor approve of the conduct of his own country; or, did he hold that Mexico was in the right. And secondly, when that war had been waged, up to the time of the treaty of peace, does he not know that Gen. Taylor was in favor of that acquisition of territory which has been made by the treaty.

Mr. CLAYTON.—The gentleman unintentionally assumes, by his question, a knowledge of Gen. Taylor's opinions which his published declarations do not justify, and about which neither he nor I can have any knowledge. We know nothing of General Taylor's opinions except from the letters which have been published to the world; and in them he has given no opinion upon the subject to which the gentleman refers, nor can I conceive that it is of the slightest importance. As a soldier, his position made it improper to question any command of the Chief Magistrate, and his duty was obedience. It is not necessary, in this connection, to discuss the question whether the Mexican war was just and necessary or not. If Mr. Polk were running as the candidate, I might have something to say on the subject; and when treating of the claims of Gen. Cass, who approved by his speeches and votes in this chamber every act and saying of Mr. Polk on wars, it may be taken up with propriety. But, so far as Gen. Taylor is concerned, the question has passed away with the war in which he did his whole duty! If he announces himself distinctly opposed to acquisition by conquest hereafter, the question as to the justice of the Mexican war, so far as he is concerned, ceases to have the least importance with men of any party, in the Presidential campaign.

Gen. Taylor has done more to terminate the war than any fifty democrats in this nation. Even the Baltimore convention, in the midst of all its party action, has not hesitated to introduce an acknowledgment that Gen. Taylor and his gallant army, with the other American armies, have done every thing that could have been done for the honor and glory of the country. The platform says, that they "have carried the arms of the nation into Mexico, crowning it with imperishable glory;" that "their unconquerable courage, their daring enterprise, their unflinching perseverance and fortitude when assailed on all sides by innumerable foes, and that more formidable enemy, the diseases of the climate, exalt their devoted patriotism into the highest heroism, and give them a right to the profound gratitude of their country and the admiration of the world."

Gen. Taylor was not a candidate when this resolution was adopted. They thought, perhaps, that General Taylor would not be nominated; but they did justice to the gallant veteran. And I hope that at this moment the democracy of the Union are prepared to unite with the honorable gentleman from Mississippi in eulogiums upon the public and private virtues of Gen. Taylor.

With regard to Gen. Taylor's opinion on the Wilmot Proviso, the Senator has the same information that I have. He knows what interpretation ought to be put upon the Allison letter, and I hope Gen. Taylor may never assume the attitude of a sectional or geographical candidate. Suffer me to say for myself, that although acting in the spirit of the request of the Legislature of Delaware, my colleague and myself, the representatives of a slaveholding State, voted for the extension of the ordinance of 1787 over the territories of the United States to prevent the acquisition of any more slave territory, yet we do not intend ever to connect ourselves with any geographical party upon such an issue. We abhor such an issue in the party struggles of the day, as leading to the most fatal consequences. We look upon the introduction of a geographical party upon such a principle, as tending directly to the destruction of the Union of these States; and there is not one State within this Confederacy that loves the Union more than the smallest in population among them all—whose lofty patriotism has become a proverb, and whose proudest boast is, that she was the first to adopt the American Constitution, and will be the last to desert it. No sir. The men of Delaware will connect themselves with no such geographical movement. Most of us entertain the opinion that, when the action of Congress is invoked, free soil shall remain free, and that slave territory ought to remain such. The doctrine prevailed among us at the time of the Missouri compromise, and still prevails, that Congress should leave the territory as they found it. We desire to abide by the compromises of the Constitu-

[CONCLUDED ON SECOND PAGE.]