

Terms of the Watchman. For Subscription, per year, Two Dollars—payable in advance. But if not paid in advance, Two Dollars and fifty cts. will be charged. Advertisements inserted at \$1 for the first, and 25 cts. for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged 50 per cent. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year. Letters to the Editors must be post paid.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH.

IN SENATE, FEB. 5.
The Slavery Question.—Mr. Clay's Compromise.

(CONTINUED.)

The power then, Mr. President, in my opinion—and I will extend it to the introduction as well as the prohibition of slavery in the new territories—I think the power does exist in Congress, and I think there is that important distinction between slavery outside of the States and slavery inside of the States, that all outside is debatable. The Government has no right to touch the institution within the States; but whether she has, and to what extent she has the right or not to touch it outside of the States, is a question which is debatable, and upon which men may honestly and fairly differ, but which, decided however it may be decided, furnishes, in my judgment, no just occasion for breaking up this happy and glorious Union of ours.

Now, I am not going to take up that part of the subject which relates to the power of Congress to legislate either within this District—I shall have occasion to make some observations upon that when I approach the resolution relating to the Territories—either within this District or the Territories. But I must say, in a few words, that I think there are two sources of power, either of which is, in my judgment, sufficient to warrant the exercise of the power, if it was deemed proper to exercise it, either to introduce or to keep out slavery, outside the States, within the Territories.

Mr. President, I shall not take up time, of which already so much has been consumed, to show that, according to my sense of the constitution of the United States, or rather according to the sense in which the clause has been interpreted for the last fifty years, the clause which confers on Congress the power to regulate the Territories and other property of the United States conveys the authority.

Mr. President, with my worthy friend from Michigan—and I use the term in the best and most emphatic sense, for I believe he and I have known each other longer than he or I have known any other Senator in this hall—I cannot concur, although I entertain the most profound respect for the opinions he has advanced upon the subject adverse to my own; but I must say, when a point is settled by all the elementary writers of our country, by all the departments of our Government, legislative, executive, and judicial—when it has been so settled for a period of fifty years, and never was seriously disturbed till recently, that I think, if we are to regard any thing as fixed and settled under the administration of this constitution of ours, it is a question which has thus been invariably and uniformly settled in a particular way. Or are we to come to this conclusion, that nothing, nothing on earth is settled under this constitution, but that every thing is unsettled?

Mr. President, we have to recollect it is very possible—sir, it is quite likely—that when that constitution was framed the application of it to such Territories as Louisiana, Florida, California, and New Mexico was never within the contemplation of its framers. It will be recollected that when that constitution was framed the whole country northwest of the river Ohio was unpeopled; and it will be recollected also that the exercise and the assertion of the power to make governments for Territories in their infant state are, in the nature of the power, temporary, and terminate whenever they have acquired a population competent for self-government. Sixty thousand is the number fixed by the ordinance of 1787. Now, sir, recollect that when this constitution was adopted, and that territory was unpeopled, it is possible that Congress, to whom it had been ceded by the States for the common benefit of the ceding State and all other members of the Union—is it possible that Congress has no right whatever to declare what description of settlers should occupy the public lands? Suppose they took up the opinion that the introduction of slavery would enhance the value of the land, and enable them to command for the public treasury a greater amount from that source of revenue than by the exclusion of slaves, would they not have had the right to say, in fixing the rules, regulations, or whatever we choose to call them, for the government of that Territory, that any one that chooses to bring slaves may bring them, and that will enhance the value of the property, in the clearing and cultivation of the soil, and add to the importance of the country? Or take the reverse: suppose Congress might think that a greater amount of revenue would be derived from the introduction of slavery, would they not have a right to interdict it? Why, sir, remember how these settlements were made, and what was their progress. They began with a few. I believe that about Marietta the first settlement was made. It was a settlement of some two or three hundred persons from New England. Cincinnati, I believe, was the next point where a settlement was made. It was settled by a few persons from New Jersey, or some other State. Did not a few settlers, the moment they arrived, acquire sovereign rights? Had they not a right to govern themselves—a handful of men established themselves at Marietta and Cincinnati? No, sir; the contemplation

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, Editors & Proprietors. "KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR RULES." Do THIS, AND LIBERTY IS SAFE. Gen'l Harrison. NEW SERIES. VOLUME VI—NUMBER 48.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1850.

of the constitution no doubt was, that, inasmuch as this power was temporary, and as that territory will become peopled gradually, insensibly, until it reaches a population which may entitle it to the benefit of self government, in the mean time it is right and proper that Congress, who owns the soil, should regulate the settlement of the soil, and govern the settlers on the soil until those settlers acquire number and capacity to govern themselves.

Sir, I will not further dwell upon this part of the subject; but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, equally conclusive in my mind as that which relates to the territories, and that is the treaty-making power—the acquiring power. Now, I put it to gentlemen, is there not at this moment a power somewhere existing either to admit or exclude slavery from the ceded territory? It is not an annihilated power. That is impossible. It is a subsisting, actual existing power; and where does it exist? It existed, I presume no one will controvert, in Mexico prior to the cession of these territories. Mexico could have abolished slavery or introduced slavery either in California or Mexico. That must be conceded. Who will controvert this position? Well, Mexico has parted from the territory and from the sovereignty over the territory; and to whom did she transfer it? She transferred the territory and the sovereignty of the territory to the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States, then, acquires in sovereignty and in territory over California and New Mexico, all, either in sovereignty or territory, that Mexico held in California or New Mexico, by the cession of those territories. Sir, dispute that who can. The power exists or it does not; no one will contend for its annihilation. It existed in Mexico. No one, I think, can deny that Mexico alienates the sovereignty over the territory, and her alienance is the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States, then, possesses all the power which Mexico possessed over the ceded Territories, and the Government of the United States can do in reference to them—within, I admit, certain limits of the constitution—whatever Mexico could have done. There are prohibitions upon the power of Congress within the constitution, which prohibitions, I admit, must apply to Congress whenever she legislates, whether for the old States or for the new Territories; but, within those prohibitions, the powers of the United States over the ceded territories are co-extensive and equal to the powers of Mexico in the ceded territories prior to the cession.

Sir, in regard to this treaty-making power, all who have any occasion to examine into its character and to the possible extent to which it may be carried, know that it is a power unlimited in its nature, except in so far as any limitation may be found in the Constitution of the United States; and upon this subject there is no limitation which prescribes the extent to which the powers should be exercised. I know, sir, it is argued that there is no grant of power in the constitution in specific terms over the subject of slavery any where; and there is no grant in the constitution to Congress specifically over the subject of a vast variety of matters upon which the powers of Congress may unquestionably operate. The major includes the minor. The general grant of power comprehends all the particulars and elements of which that power consists. The power of acquisition by treaty draws after it the power of government of the country acquired. If there be a power to acquire, there must be, to use the language of the tribunal that sits below, a power to govern. I think, therefore, sir, without, at least for the present, dwelling further on this part of the subject, that to the two sources of authority in Congress to which I have referred, and especially to the last, may be traced the power of Congress to act in the territories in question; and, sir, I go to the extent, and I think it is a power in Congress equal to the introduction or exclusion of slavery. I admit the argument in both its forms; I admit if the argument be maintained that the power exists to exclude slavery, it necessarily follows that the power must exist, if Congress choose to exercise it, to tolerate or introduce slavery within the territories.

But, sir, I have been drawn off so far from the second resolution—not from the object of it, but from a particular view of it—that it has almost gone out of recollection. The resolution asserts—
"That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction into or exclusion from any part of the said territory; and that appropriate Territorial Governments ought to be established by Congress in all of the said territory, not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery."

The great truth which I respectfully and with great deference conceive to exist, and which is announced in this resolu-

tion, is, that slavery is not likely to be introduced into any of these territories. Well, sir, is not that a fact? Is there a member who hears me that will not confirm the fact? What has occurred within the last three months? In California, more than in any other portion of the ceded territory, was it most probable, if slavery was adapted to the interests of the industrial pursuits of the inhabitants, that slavery would have been introduced? Yet, within the space of three or four months, California herself has declared, by a unanimous vote of her Convention, against the introduction of slavery within her limits. And, as I remarked on a former occasion, this declaration was not confined to non-slaveholders. There were persons from the slaveholding States who concurred in that declaration. Thus this fact which is asserted in the resolution is responded to by the act of California. Then, sir, if we come down to those mountain regions which are to be found in New Mexico, the nature of its soil and country, its barrenness, its unproductive character, every thing which relates to it, and every thing which we hear of it, and about it, must necessarily lead to the conclusion which I have mentioned, that slavery is not likely to be introduced into them. Well, sir, if it be true that by law slavery does not now exist in the ceded territories, and that it is not likely to be introduced into the ceded territories—if you, Senators, agree to these truths, or a majority of you, as I am persuaded a large majority of you must agree them—where is the objection or the difficulty to your announcing them to the whole world? Why should you hesitate or falter in the promulgation of incontestable truths? On the other hand, with regard to Senators coming from the free States, allow me here to make, with reference to California, one or two observations. When this feeling within the limits of your States was gotten up; when the Wilmot proviso was disseminated through them, and your people and yourselves to that proviso, what was the state of facts? The state of facts at that time was, that you apprehended the introduction of slavery there. You did not know much—very few of us now know much—about these very territories. They were far distant from you. You were apprehensive that slavery might be introduced there. You wanted as a protection to introduce the interdiction called the Wilmot proviso. It was in this state of want of information that the whole North blazed up in behalf of this Wilmot proviso. It was under the apprehension that slavery might be introduced there that you left your constituents. For when you came from home, at the time you left your respective residences, you did not know the fact, which has only reached us since the commencement of the session of Congress, that a constitution had been unanimously adopted by the people of California, excluding slavery from their territory.

Well, now, let me suppose that two years ago if it had been known in the free States that such a constitution would be adopted; let me suppose that it had been believed that in no other portion of these ceded territories would slavery be introduced; let me suppose that upon the great subject of solicitude, negro slavery, a people of the North had been perfectly satisfied that there was no danger; let me also suppose that they had foreseen the excitement, the danger, the irritation, the resolutions which have been adopted by Southern Legislatures, and the manifestations of opinion by the people of the slaveholding States—let me suppose that all this had been known at the North at the time when the agitation was first got up upon the subject of this Wilmot proviso—do you believe that it would have ever reached the height to which it has attained? Do any one of you believe it? And if, prior to your departure from your respective homes, you had had an opportunity of conferring with your constituents upon this most leading and important fact—the adoption of a constitution excluding slavery in California—do you not believe, Senators and Representatives coming from the free States, that if you had had the advantage of that fact told in serious, calm, fire side conversation with your constituents, they would not have told you to come here and to settle all these agitating questions without danger to this Union?

What do you want? What do you want who reside in the free States? You want that there shall be no slavery introduced into the territories acquired from Mexico. Well, have not you got it in California already, if admitted as a State? Have not you got it in New Mexico, in all human probability, also? What more do you want? You have got what is worth a thousand Wilmot provisos. You have got nature itself on your side. You have the fact itself on your side. You have the truth staring you in the face that no slavery is existing there. Well, if you are men; if you can rise from the mud and slough of party struggles and elevate yourselves to the height of patriots, what will you do? You will look at the fact as it exists. You will say this fact was unknown to my people. You will say, they acted on one set of facts, we have got another set of facts here influencing us, and we will act as patriots, as responsible men, as lovers of unity, and above all of

this Union. We will act on the altered set of facts unknown to our constituents, and we will appeal to their justice, their honor, their magnanimity to concur with us on this occasion, for establishing concord and harmony and maintaining the existence of this glorious Union.

Well, Mr. President, I think entertaining these views, that there was nothing extravagant in the hope in which I indulged at the time these resolutions were prepared and offered—nothing extravagant in the hope that the North might content itself even with striking out as unnecessary these two declarations. They are unnecessary for any purpose the free States have in view. At all events, if they should insist upon Congress expressing the opinions which are here asserted, that, at all events, they should limit their wishes to the simple assertion of them, without insisting on their being incorporated in any Territorial Government which Congress may establish in the Territories.

I pass on from the second resolution to the third and fourth, which relate to Texas; and allow me to say, Mr. President, that I approach the subject with a full knowledge of all its difficulties; and of all the questions connected with or growing out of this institution of slavery which Congress is called upon to pass upon and decide: there are none so difficult and troublesome as those which relate to Texas, because, sir, Texas has a question of boundary to settle, and a question of slavery, or the feelings connected with it run into the question of boundary. The North, perhaps, will be anxious to contract Texas within the narrow possible limits, in order to exclude all beyond her to make it a free territory; the South, on the contrary, may be anxious to extend these limits to the sources of the Rio Grande, for the purpose of creating an additional theatre for slavery; and thus, to the question of the limits of Texas, and the settlement of her boundary, the slavery question, with all its troubles and difficulties, is added, meeting us at every step we take.

There is, sir, a third question, also, adding to the difficulty. By the resolution of annexation slavery was interdicted in all north of 36° 30'; but of New Mexico, that portion of it which lies 36° 30' embraces, I think, about one-third of the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande; so that you have free and slave territory mixed, boundary and slavery mixed together, and all these difficulties are to be encountered. And allow me to say, sir, that among the considerations which induce me to think that it was necessary to settle all these questions, was the state of things that now exists in New Mexico, and the state of things to be apprehended both there and in other portions of the Territories. Why, sir, at this moment—and I think I shall have the concurrence of the two Senators from that State when I announce the fact—at this moment there is a feeling approximating to abhorrence on the part of the people of New Mexico at the idea of any union with Texas.

Mr. RUSK. Only, sir, on the part of the office-seekers and army followers who have settled there, and attempted to mislead the people.

Mr. CLAY. Ah! Sir, that may be, and I am afraid that Mexico is not the only place where this class composes a majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] Now, sir, if the questions are not settled which relate to Texas, her boundaries, and so forth, and to the territory now claimed by Texas and disputed by New Mexico—the territories beyond New Mexico which are excluded from California—if the questions are not settled, I think they will give rise to future confusion, disorder, and anarchy, and to agitation here. There will be, I have no doubt, a party still at the North crying out, if these questions are not settled this session, for the Wilmot Proviso, or some other restriction upon them, and we shall absolutely do nothing in my opinion, if we do not accommodate all these difficulties and provide against the recurrence of all these dangers.

Sir, with respect to the state of things in N. Mexico, allow me to call the attention of the Senate to what I consider as the highest authority I could offer to them as to the state of things there existing. I mean in the acts of their Convention, unless that Convention happens to have been composed altogether of office seekers, office-holders, and so forth. Now, sir, I call your attention to what they say in depicting their own situation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, at Mr. CLAY'S request, read the following extract from instructions as adopted by the Convention, appended to the journal of the Convention of the Territory of New Mexico, held at the city of Santa Fe, in September, 1849:

"We, the people of New Mexico, in Convention assembled, having elected a Delegate to represent this Territory in the Congress of the United States, and to urge upon the Supreme Government a redress of our grievances, and the protection due to us as citizens of our common country, under the Constitution, instruct him as follows: That whereas, for the last three years, we have suffered under the paralyzing effects of a government undefined and doubtful in its character, inefficient to protect the rights of the people, or to discharge the high and absolute duty of every Government, the enforcement and regular administration of its own laws, in consequence of which, industry and enterprise are paralysed, and discontent and confusion prevail throughout the land. The want of proper protection against the various barbarous tribes of Indians that surround us on every side, has prevented the extension of settlements upon our valuable public domain, and rendered utterly futile every attempt to explore or develop the great resources of the Territory. Surrounded by the Utahs, Camanches, and Apaches on the north, east, and south, by the Navajos on the west, with Jicarillas within our limits, and without any adequate protection against their hostile inroads, our flocks and herds are driven off by thousands, our fellow-citizens, men, women, and children, are murdered or carried into captivity. Many of our citizens, of all ages and

sexes, are at this moment suffering all the horrors of barbarian bondage, and it is utterly out of our power to obtain their release from a condition to which death would be preferable.—The wealth of our Territory is being diminished. We have neither the means nor any adopted plan by Government for the education of the rising generation. In fine, with a government temporary, doubtful, uncertain, and inefficient in character and in operation, surrounded and despoiled by barbarous foes, ruin appears inevitably before us, unless speedy and effectual protection be extended to us by the Congress of the United States."

There is a series of resolutions, Mr. President, which any gentleman may look at, if he chooses; but I think it is not worth while to take up the time of the Senate in reading it.

That is the condition, sir, of N. Mexico. Well, I suspect that to go beyond it, to go beyond the Rio Grande to the territory which is not claimed by Texas, you will not find a much better state of things. In fact, sir, I cannot for a moment reconcile it to my sense of duty to suffer Congress to adjourn without an effort, at least being made to extend the benefits, the blessings of government to those people who have recently been acquired by us.

Sir, with regard to that portion of New Mexico which lies east of the Rio Grande, undoubtedly, it is conceded to Texas, while she has office holders and office seekers as much as those Senator from Texas, if they possibly be drawn together and governed quietly, peaceably, and comfortably, there might be a remedy, so far as relates to the country east of the Rio Grande; but all beyond it—Deseret and the north of California—would be still open and liable to all the consequences of disunion, confusion, and anarchy, without some stable government emanating from the authority of the nation of which they now compose a part, and with which they are but little acquainted. I think, therefore, that all these questions, difficult and troublesome as they may be, ought to be met; met in a spirit of candor and calmness, and decided upon as a matter of duty.

Now, these two resolutions which we have immediately under consideration propose a decision of these questions. I have said, sir, that there is scarcely a resolution in the series which I have offered that does not contain some mutual concession or evidence of mutual forbearance, where the concession was not altogether from the non-slaveholding to the slaveholding States.

Now, with respect to this resolution proposing a boundary for Texas, what is it? We know the difference of opinion which has existed in this country with respect to that boundary. We know that a very large portion of the people of the United States have supposed that the western limit of Texas was the Nueces, and that it did not extend to the Rio Grande. We know, by the resolution of annexation, that the question of what is the western limit and the northern limit of Texas, was an open question—that it has been all along an open question. It was an open question when the boundary was run, in virtue of the act of 1835, marking the boundary between the U. States and Texas. Sir, at that time the boundary authorized by the act of 1835, was a boundary commencing at the mouth of the Sabine and running up to its head, thence to Red river, thence westwardly with Red river, to I think the hundredth degree of west longitude. Well, sir, that did not go so far as Texas now claims; and why? Because it was an open question. War was yet raging between Texas and Mexico; and it was not foreseen exactly what might be herultimate limits. But, sir, we will come to the question of what was done at the time of her annexation. This whole resolution which relates to the question of boundary, from beginning to end, assumes an open boundary, an unascertained, unfixed boundary to Texas on the west. Sir, what is the first part of the resolution? It is that "Congress doth consent that the territory properly included within and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State." Properly included—in rightfully belong to. The resolution specifies no boundary. It could specify none. It has specified no western or northern boundary for Texas. It has assumed in this state of uncertainty what we know in point of fact existed. But the latter part of it:—"Said State to be formed subject to the adjustment of all questions of boundary that may arise with other Governments, and the constitution thereof," &c. That is to say, she is annexed with her rightful and proper boundaries, without a specification of them; but inasmuch as it was known that these boundaries at the west and the north were unsettled, the Government of the United States retained to itself the power of settling with any foreign nation what the boundary should be.

Now, sir, it is impossible for me to go into the whole question and to argue it fully. I mean to express opinions or impressions rather than to go into the entire argument. The Western and northern limit of Texas being unsettled, and the Government of the U. States having retained the power of settling it, I ask, suppose the power had been exercised, and that there had been no cession of territory by Mexico to the United States, but that the negotiations between the two countries had been limited simply to the fixation of the western and northern limits of Texas, could it not have been done by the United States and Mexico conjointly? Will any one dispute it? Suppose there had been a treaty of limits of Texas as concluded between Mexico and the United States, fixing the Nueces as the Western limit of Texas, would not Texas have been bound by it? Why, by the express terms of the resolution she would have been bound by it; or, if it had been the Colorado or the Rio Grande, or any other boundary, whatever western limit had been fixed by the joint action of the two Powers, would have been binding and obligatory upon Texas by the express terms of the resolution by which she was admitted into the Union. Now, sir, if Mexico and the United States conjointly, by treaty, might have fixed upon the western northern limits of Texas, and if the United States have acquired by treaty all the subjects upon which the limits of Texas

might have operated, have not the U. States now the power solely and exclusively which Mexico and the United States conjointly possessed prior to the late treaty between the two countries? It seems to me, sir, that this conclusion and reasoning is perfectly irresistible. If Mexico and the United States could have fixed upon any western limit for Texas, and did not do it, and if the United States have acquired to themselves or acquired by the treaty in question, all the territory upon which the western limit must have been fixed, when it was fixed, it seems to me that no one can resist the logical conclusion that the United States now have themselves a power to do what the U. States and Mexico conjointly could have done.

Sir, I admit it is a delicate power—an extremely delicate power. I admit that it ought to be exercised in a spirit of justice, liberality, and generosity towards the youngest member of the great American family. But here the power is. Possibly, sir, upon that question—however I offer no positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix it in a way unjust in the opinion of Texas, and contrary to her rights, she might bring the question before the Supreme Court of the United States, and have it there again investigated and decided.—I say possibly, sir, because I am not one of the class of politicians who believe that every question a competent and proper question for the Supreme Court of the U. States. There are questions too large for any tribunal of that kind to try; great political questions, national territorial questions, which transcend their limits; for such questions or not, I shall not decide; but I will maintain that the United States are now invested solely and exclusively with that power which was common to both nations—to fix, ascertain, and settle the western and northern limits of Texas.

Sir, the other day my honorable friend who represents so well the State of Texas, said that we had no more right to touch the limits of Texas than we had to touch the limits of Kentucky. I think that the illustration he gave us—that a State is one and indivisible, and that the General Government has no right to sever it. I agree with him, sir, in that; where the limits are ascertained and certain, where they are undisputed and indisputable. The General Government has no right, nor has any other earthly power the right, to interfere with the limits of a State whose boundaries are thus fixed, thus ascertained, known, and recognised. The whole power, at least, to interfere with it is voluntary. The extreme case may be put—one which I trust in God may never happen in this nation—of a conquered nation, and of a constitution adopting itself to the state of subjugation or conquest to which it has been reduced; and giving up whole States, as well as parts of States, in order to save from the conquering arms of the invader what remains. I say such a power in case of extremity may exist. But I admit that, short of such extremity, voluntarily, the General Government has no right to separate a State—to take a portion of its territory from it, or to regard it otherwise than as integral, one and indivisible, and not to be affected by any legislation of ours. But, then, I assume, what does not exist in the case of Texas, that these boundaries must be known, ascertained, and indisputable. With regard to Texas, all was open, all was unfixed; all is unfixed at this moment, with respect to her limits west and north of the Nueces.

But, sir, we gave fifteen millions of dollars for this territory that we bought, and God knows what a costly bargain to this now distracted country it has been! We gave fifteen millions of dollars for the territory ceded to us by Mexico. Can Texas justly, fairly, and honorably come into the Union and claim all that she has asserted a right to, without paying any portion of the fifteen millions of dollars which constituted the consideration of the grant by the ceded nation to the United States? She proposes no such thing. She talks, indeed, about the United States having been her agent, her trustee. Why, sir, the United States was no more her agent or her trustee than she was the agent or trustee of the whole people of the United States. Texas involved herself in war—(I mean to make this no reproach—none—upon the past)—Texas brought herself into a state of war, and, when she got into that war, it was not the war of Texas and Mexico, but it was the war of the whole thirty United States and Mexico; it was a war in which the Government of the United States, which created the hostilities, was as much the trustee and agent of the twenty-nine other States composing the Union as she was the trustee and agent of Texas. And, sir, with respect to all these circumstances—such, for example, as a treaty with a map annexed, as in the case of the recent treaty with Mexico; such as the opinion of individuals highly respected and eminent, like the lamented Mr. Polk, late President of the United States, whose opinion was that he had no right, as President of the United States, or in any character otherwise than as negotiating with Mexico—and in that the Senate would have to act in concurrence with him—that he had no right to fix the boundary; and as to the map attached to the treaty, it is sufficient to say that the treaty itself is silent from beginning to end on the subject of the fixation of the boundary of Texas. The annexation of the map to the treaty was a matter of no utility, for the treaty is not strengthened by it; it no more affirms the truth of any thing delineated upon that map in relation to Texas than it does any thing in relation to any other geographical subject that composed the map.

Mr. President, I have said that I think the power has been concentrated in the Government of the United States to fix upon the limits of the State of Texas. I have said also that this power ought to be exercised in a spirit of great liberality and justice; and I put it to you, sir, to say, in reference to this second resolution of mine, whether that liberality and justice has not been displayed in the resolution which I have proposed? To confine her to the Nueces—No, sir. To extend her boundary to the mouth of the Rio Grande, and thence up that river to the southern limit of New Mexico; and thence along that limit to the boundary between the United States and Spain, as marked under the treaty of 1819. Why, sir, here is a vast country. I believe—although I have made no estimate about it—that it is not inferior in extent of land, of acres, of square miles, to what Texas east of the river Nueces, extending to the Sabine, had before. And who is there can say with truth and justice that there is no reciprocity, no mutuality, no concession, in this resolution, made to Texas, even in reference to the question of boundary alone? You give her a vast country, equal, I repeat, in extent nearly to what she indisputably possessed before; a country sufficiently large, with her consent, hereafter to carve out of it some two or three additional States when the condition of the population may render it expedient to make new States. Sir, is there not in this resolu-