Mr. HUNT said that when he addressed the House, at an early stage of the session, on the subject of the Mexican war, he expressed his opposition to making it a war of territorial conquest, and offered a proposition declaring, in effect, that it ought not to be prosecuted with a view to the dismemberment of Mexico. He did not then press the proposition to a vote, believing, from various indications, that time and the current of events would harmonize conflicting opinions, and ensure a more emphatic and united expression. He believed the time was approaching when the public voice would compel the Administration to abandon its wild schemes of territorial aggrandizement, and return to a policy more accordant with the nature of our institutions, and the true honor of the country.

On the occasion to which he referred, he had entered at some length into the reasons of his opposition to foreign conquests, and his disapprobation of the aggressive purposes for which the war is now prosecuted. It was not his intention to enlarge upon those considerations at this time. He would content himself with a mere reference to some of the more prominent of his objections. In the first place, he contended that we already possess as much territory as we ought to desire: enough for every rational and enlightened purpose; enough for ourselves and the generations who are to come after us; enough to gratify even the extravagant of national pride and ambition. We possess vast regions—millions upon millions of acres, as yet untrodden by the foot of civilized man. We have extended our sway from sea to sea, till it covers an empire as broad as can be preserved or wisely regulated by any human government whilst public agents continue to be mortal and imperfect. By enlarging our possessions, already so widely extended, we shall derive no increase of national strength, prosperity, or happiness. If we acquire New Mexico and California, he almost trembled to think of the character of the population which must come with them into our Confederacy. We must prepare to receive an incongruous mass of Spaniards, Indians, and mongrel Mexicans—a medley of mixed races, who are fitted neither to enjoy nor to administer our free institutions: men of different blood and language, who cannot dwell and mingle with our people on a footing of social or political equality. They must be governed as a colonial dependency, under provincial laws, or else be incorporated into our federal system, to become an eternal source of strife, anarchy, and civil commotion.

The forcible conquest of these territories involves other questions. By what moral or political right do we propose to dismember Mexico and extort a surrender of her provinces? We hear much of national honor and glory, but national honesty seems only to be thought of as an obsolete virtue. To raise the question of right, is viewed, if not as "moral treason," as a weakness of conscience, since we have the power to take what we desire. His own views might appear singular to some gentlemen, but he confessed he felt a painful conviction, that, in putting forth our military power to despoil a neighboring republic, our Government has placed itself in a very doubtful, not to say humiliating attitude, before the world. It is a page of our history which will cause many an honest American to blush for his country. The effect of military conquest upon our frame of Government: its tendency to disturb the balances of the Constitution; to augment and strengthen the Executive power, that fruitful source of corruption and intrigue; its repugnance to the genius and spirit of our political system; these and kindred considerations, are worthy of profound and anxious deliberation. But he would not attempt, on the present occasion, to discuss that branch of the subject.

Mr. H. considered the policy of the Administration extremely mischievous in another point of view. We are in a war. On all sides we hear professions of an earnest desire for peace. Yet, a policy is pursued which is calculated to make the war interminable. To him it seemed idle to expect a restoration of peace whilst we insist on holding, as a permanent acquisition, a large portion of the territory of Mexico. Territory is made a preliminary condition, as the beginning
and end, and only basis of negotiation. No nation on earth can submit to it without deep disgrace and degradation. Mexico may be compelled to surrender all that we demand, but he feared it would first be necessary to subordinate the Union by an appalling expenditure of life and treasure.

If, however, all these considerations are entitled to no weight, there remains another, which ought to have restrained the Administration from its new and perilous career. They ought to have foreseen that great sectional struggle which has now begun. It was the necessary and obvious result of their territorial policy. Nothing short of absolute blindness or desperation could have failed to discern the coming storm. If true patriotism had animated the executive councils, if ordinary wisdom and prudence had governed the conduct of affairs, how easily this sectional conflict might have been avoided. But it seemed as if "madness ruled the hour." Our Chief Magistrate—to whose hands the people, in an evil hour, committed the safety of the Union, and whose first duty it was to cherish those sentiments of national concord which bind together the different sections of our common country, recreant to that sacred trust—has plunged into a wild career of aggression and rapacity, and shown himself regardless of our revolutionary inheritance, in his infatuated pursuit of glory and foreign conquest.

The Executive is apparently unmoved even now, when the voice of disunion is daily swelling in his ears from the halls of Congress. His policy has brought the North and the South into fearful collision, on a question which admits of no compromise. Mr. H. said he deplored these sectional prosecuting schemes of conquest, which of necessity roused into action new and angry elements of discord between the two great divisions of the country.

Mr. H. said it was not his purpose to enter upon a discussion of slavery in the abstract. He would not attempt to follow in the track of the reverend gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Seaborn Jones,] who had just appeared before the House in so extraordinary a character. He always understood that gentleman was distinguished at the bar of his State for legal skill and acumen, and that he had acquired much celebrity as a successful pleader, especially in the defence of criminals. His efforts here have been worthy of his professional fame. But to-day he has assumed the new quality of a religious exposito. Instead of a speech, he has given us a homily. With the Bible in his hand, he has assailed us with scriptural quotations, and undertaken the pious office of proving the slavish condition of the Christ to subjugate the country to the holy sanctions of religion over a system of servitude which can be defended only by arguments drawn from necessity or mere human expediency.

He intended no personal reflection upon the gentleman or his motives. But he must say, that he regretted the attempt which had been made to throw the holy sanctions of religion over a system of servitude which can be defended only by arguments drawn from necessity or mere human expediency.

He considered this mode of argument, on such a subject, repugnant alike to correct taste and sound reasoning.

Mr. Chairman, the real question now presented is, whether slavery shall be ingrafted upon free territory, by the action of the General Government? Shall the national force and treasure be employed with so much success to maintain the divine right of kings, and to enforce the doctrine of passive obedience to arbitrary power. This is not the first time that Holy Writ has been perverted from its true spirit and meaning. History abounds in examples that illustrate the form in which the purport of Revelations may be brought, by art of interpretation, to sustain tyranny and deprive mankind of their dearest rights.

At this point in Mr. Hunt's speech, the venerable figure of the honorable John Quincy Adams was perceived entering the central door of the Hall. The eyes of the members and of the spectators in the gallery were instantly drawn to him, and Mr. Holmes of South Carolina, and Mr. Moseley of New York, approached and conducted him respectfully to the seat he had occupied on the floor during the last and many previous sessions. The members rose in their places. The seat had never been temporarily occupied by Mr. Asa G. Johnson, of Tennessee, who, by a late rule of the House, was entitled to hold it, as he had selected it, on the drawing of his name, from seats remaining vacant. But he immediately rose, and promptly surrendering the seat, reminded the House that when he selected that seat, he had declared that the moment its former venerable occupant should appear, he would instantly give it up. He now did so with great pleasure, and expressed his gratification at seeing Mr. Adams once more, and congratulated him on having been spared to recoup his place in that Hall.

Mr. Adams was soon surrounded by his friends, who clustered round him, tendering their congratulations and welcomes.

He expressed his thanks (in a feeble voice) for the kind manner in which he had been received by gentlemen of all parties.

Mr. HUNT, who had suspended his remarks during this interesting scene, now resumed; but said, that before he proceeded, he hoped he might be permitted to express the lively emotions of pleasure he experienced at the reappearance of his venerable friend, and his sincere satisfaction at the general expression of respect and veneration by which the House had greeted him. It was an assurance to that gentleman of that general homage which was paid to his name by the people of the United States, whatever might be their political distinctions or party predilections.

But to resume: The effort of the honorable gentleman from Georgia was at least calculated to remind one of a familiar quotation—

"He stole the livery of the Court of Heaven
To serve the devil in."

He intended no personal reflection upon the gentleman or his motives. But he must say, that he regretted the attempt which had been made to throw the holy sanctions of religion over a system of servitude which can be defended only by arguments drawn from necessity or mere human expediency. He considered this mode of argument, on such a subject, repugnant alike to correct taste and sound reasoning.

Mr. Chairman, the real question now presented is, whether slavery shall be ingrafted upon free territory, by the action of the General Government? Shall the national force and treasure be employed...
to enlarge and extend the area of slavery? Till within a recent period, the southern people have contended that slavery is a domestic institution of the States where it exists; that it belongs to their own exclusive legislation and control; and that Congress has no constitutional power over the subject.

Formerly they planted themselves upon the impregnable grounds of the Constitution. They insisted that any exercise of the Federal power respecting slavery was an invasion of the reserved rights of the States, and they proclaimed, year after year, that any legislation of the question here would produce a disavowal of the Union. The North assented to your construction of the constitutional compact. We declared our readiness to abide by the Constitution, and to observe all its compromises with religious fidelity. We have uniformly disclaimed any desire or purpose to interfere with slavery in the States where it is established. It is true that extreme opinions have been advanced by individuals in both sections, but the northern people have never sought or desired any exercise of power by the General Government inconsistent with the rights of the southern States. It is not our fault that the Government has interfered with the question of slavery. Southern policy produced a departure from the broad ground of neutrality and non-interference. It is now about three years since the doctrine was distinctly put forth on this floor, for the first time, that the protection and support of slavery, and even its extension by annexation of foreign territory, were objects falling within the rightful power and jurisdiction of Congress. I remember it well. The principle was first avowed by the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. Holmes,] in the opening scene of that great struggle which resulted in the annexation of Texas. I denounced the doctrine then; I have resisted it, unsuccessfully, at every stage of its progress: I will resist it now and ever, while I have the power to raise my voice, however feeble, against it.

This new pretension of the South triumphed in the introduction of Texas. But it was a costly triumph. It was won by the surrender of that great constitutional principle under which the slaveholding States had claimed immunity and found safety and repose. The South threw away her shield when she proclaimed the extension of slavery to be a proper object and purpose for the exercise of Federal power. Then she descended from the intrenchments of the Constitution, and brought this question of slavery into the open field. It is here to-day, in consequence of the new policy adopted by its friends, and forced upon the Government by the aid of partisan allies in the free States. The question is here, and must be met. For one, I am ready to meet it firmly and fearlessly; yet, I trust, in a spirit of national fraternity and kindness, uninfluenced by sectional feeling or prejudice.

It would be idle to disguise that a wide difference of sentiment exists, and has always existed, between the northern and southern States on the subject of slavery. In the North our people are opposed to it on the highest grounds of principle, apart from all questions of expediency. They consider it unjust, oppressive, and violative of the inherent, inalienable right of personal liberty. They regard it, in every aspect, as a moral and political evil. Whilst this sentiment pervades the free States, we would indulge in no unhind reproofs upon the States where slavery exists. You of the present day are not responsible for its existence. It is part of that social system which you received from the past; and we appreciate the difficulty of disturbing relations so closely interwoven with the very framework of society. I have always seen and admitted the obstacles in the way of emancipation, and have uniformly contended that neither the free States nor this Government, have any rightful power over it.

The question must be left to the communities more directly concerned; each deciding and acting exclusively for itself. Not more from necessity than from inclination would we leave the States of the South to regulate their internal condition, and, under the guidance of Providence, to solve their own ultimate destiny. In a spirit of fraternal kindness we would maintain those States in the enjoyment of every constitutional right.

But here we stop. Slavery having been extended over the Louisiana and Florida purchase, and finally over Texas, the free States have pronounced it thus far and no farther! We insist that this common Government of ours shall not be employed to spread slavery over territory now free; that human bondage shall not be carried into other lands under our national flag; and that our armies shall not go forth, under the colors of freedom, as the propagandists of slavery. That, sir, is the lofty attitude and the unalterable purpose of the North. In this there is no abolitionism to justify the necessary denunciations that have been heard. Gentlemen seem to deceive themselves by neglecting a distinction too obvious to be overlooked. We aim not to abolish but to preserve. Where slavery exists, we leave it untouched; where freedom prevails, we demand that you shall not abolish it. While gentlemen denounce the abolition of slavery as reasonable and criminal, I hope they will indulge us if we protest against the abolition of freedom in California, New Mexico, and Chihuahua.

Mr. H. here expressed his surprise at the remarkable language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. C. J. Ingersoll.] In speaking of the opposition to slavery and its extension, which exists in the northern States, he said it was "a mere sentiment held by men without reason and without argument—nothing but a sentiment, and not a very wholesome sentiment either." It is difficult to characterize an expression like this coming from the representative of a free State, without transcending the limits of parliamentary order. "A sentiment!" Yes, sir, "a sentiment." It is a sentiment which the Almighty has implanted deeply in the human breast, and no earthly power can eradicate it. It may be insulted and overborne and trampled in the earth, but, thank God, it can never be extinguished. The fires of martyrdom have been kindled often to subdue it, but in vain; it has seemed to expire on many a battlefield, but only to revive with new energy and beauty. It is the spirit of liberty which is inherent in the soul of man. It is the sentiment which has inspired
the friends of freedom in every age. Why, sir, it was "a sentiment" which impelled the Pilgrims to encounter the perils of the ocean, and the privations of life in the wilderness, to establish freedom of conscience and secure civil liberty for themselves and their posterity. The American Revolution was the offspring of a sentiment; the right of man to self-government is a sentiment. Let the gentleman say: it is a sentiment as eternal as the throne of Divine Justice from which it emanates. It may never warm the breast of that gentleman; he may speak of it in tones of levity and ridicule; but fortunately a general truth is not weakened by individual exceptions.

Mr. H. proceeded to say that the Missouri compromise seemed to furnish one of the grounds most relied on to defeat the Wilmot proviso. We are constantly invited to abide by the compromise line. In answer to this, he would say the North has abided by that compromise, and will faithfully observe it, executed by the North. But what was the Missouri compromise? It fixed the line of 36° 30' as the division between free and slave States to be formed of the territory then belonging to the United States. It was a compact relating only to the territory then held, and must be governed, like all compacts, by contemporaneous facts and history. This compromise was based upon our boundaries as then fixed. At that time, no farther extension of limits was contemplated; and certainly no man could have dreamed that this attempt would be made to carry slavery into free territory. The Missouri compromise has been faithfully executed by the North. Have we acquired any territory north of that line, or disturbed slavery south of it? No, sir. But to the South we have given Texas, containing four slave States. With this you ought to be content. I am reminded that the Missouri compromise was recognised in the annexation of Texas. I am aware that a clause was placed in the joint resolution declaring that slavery shall not be permitted north of 36° 30'. But this was a mere device, intended to enable northern representatives, after betraying their constituents, to aunm itry to the Constitution. He considered the whole argument based on this compromise as applicable to all future acquisitions of territory, so unsound and fallacious as scarcely to merit a serious refutation. We are told, however, that the exclusion of slavery in the territory to be acquired from Mexico is unjust to the South, on general principles—that it is an infringement of her rights, and a violation of the Constitution. He must be permitted to dispute the justice of this position. With what right of the South does the proviso propose to interfere? It leaves slavery untouched in every State where it exists. In principle, it is essentially conservative. The holders of slaves are unaffected by it, and have no right to complain. He felt confident that no considerable portion of the southern people who hold no slaves will not complain. The attempt to establish slavery by the power of the Federal Government on free territory, exhibits the country in a most remarkable light. Congress, by its laws, has declared the slave trade to be piracy, and the importation of slaves is punished as a capital offence. We expend a large sum annually to maintain a naval force on the coast of Africa, to suppress that abominable trade. The whole country, north and south, have sustained this humane and benificent policy. Upon what reasoning, then, by what right, moral or political, can we rob Mexico of free territory to extend the area of slavery, and furnish a new market for slave labor? If it is criminal to steal Africans and reduce them to bondage, is it in accordance with the principles of humanity and religion to seize foreign territory for the purpose of planting negro slavery upon it?

Aside from all other considerations, Mr. H. said there were political reasons which constrained the northern people to resist the increase of slave States by further acquisitions of territory. On the subject of representation, great concessions were made to the southern States in the formation of the Constitution. We are content with this constitutional compromise, and have submitted to the inequality without a murmur. But we will never consent to increase this inequality by giving a slave representation to new States on the Pacific. The objection applies with still more force to the representation in the Senate. In that controlling branch of the Government, all the States, large and small, are equally represented. In asentning to that adjustment of power, the large States were influenced by a disinterested spirit of compromise. But the further extension of this principle, by creating new States from conquered territory, would be an utter subversion of the compact. The rapid multiplication of States from newly-acquired territory has given to the South a controlling power in the Senate. It is a process which fetters the majority, and threatens to subject two-thirds to the will of one-third of the American people. The introduction of slavery in the proposed territory will but widen the existing disparity between the northern and southern sections in respect to the population of States. It is a region which he believed to be incapable of sustaining a dense population, under the most favorable circumstances, and he did not wish to see it in the Union either as free or slave States. He desired never to see a hundred thousand people and negroes in the State of Chihuahua neutralize the voice of New York, with her three millions of freemen, in the Senate of the United States.

Amongst other objections to the proposed restriction of slavery, we are constantly told that the present is not the time to prescribe conditions; that the agitation of the question will embarrass the Executive, and prevent a vigorous prosecution of the war. This is neither more nor less than to say, that if the war is not to result in the acquisition of slave territory, then the South will withdraw from its support. In other words, unless the majority in one section will yield to the minority in the other, the Government will be unable to carry on the war. Let me assure gentlemen that nothing
can do more to enfeeble the war policy, or afford more "aid and comfort to the enemy" than the rejection of this proviso. It will be regarded by the northern people as a declaration that the war is prosecuted for the extension of slavery. Let this be proclaimed, and the Government will find itself powerless in the free States of the Union. They will not consent to carry the national flag into such a cause. The war will sink under the weight of popular odium and execration. The free States will not send their sons to battle, and submit to enormous burdens of debt and taxation to carry slavery into Mexico. It must be seen that the argument drawn from the pressing exigencies of the war has a two-fold operation. It is time we should come to an understanding. If we acquire the territory, no one can doubt the determination of the South to establish slavery upon it. The North is equally determined it shall remain free. It is obvious, therefore, that one section or the other must be deceived and cheated in the end. Then, on principles of good faith and fair dealing, we ought to come to an understanding now. If the South will not fight for free territory, and the North will not fight for slave territory, the question must occur to every mind, what are we fighting for? If it be really a war for nothing, let us unite and bring it to a speedy and honorable termination. It must be obvious to all, that if we continue to prosecute the war for territory without first settling this disputed question, we shall acquire only another element of discord in our councils, and force the two great sections into fearful strife and collision. Then why not pause and abandon the pursuit of an object which, when possessed, will produce a domestic struggle, and place the Union in jeopardy? Fortunately, we are not compelled to despoil Mexico. We are not bound, in my judgment; to bring a curse upon the country, even by way of indemnity. In my reflections upon this subject, I have sometimes regarded it as fortunate that our national system contains within itself a principle of weakness which discloses the danger of further conquests. It seems as if it were wisely ordered that the penalty of discarding the Union shall be suspended over our Government to restrain its rapacity, and compel an observance of the principles of justice and moderation.

We are admonished by the Representatives of the South, that the interdiction of slavery in the territory that may be conquered or acquired will bring the Union to an end. With equal frankness let me assure gentlemen that the free States will never consent to its admission as slave territory. That must be regarded as a settled question. The northern mind is formed and fixed. Be not deceived by the readiness with which some northern Representatives barter away the rights of their constituents. Already has their recreancy aroused the indignation of the people. The time approaches when no man here will dare to betray their confidence. Men may degrade themselves in the pursuit of office, they may prostitute themselves at the feet of the Executive, but this Congress has not the power to surrender the rights of the North on so vital a question. If you reject the proviso now, it leaves the question open, and nothing is decided. If we are defeated to-day, the struggle will be renewed with increased energy and determination to-morrow, and the final result cannot be doubtful. You may acquire the territory without restriction, but the same question will recur at every stage of your progress, as well in the creation of territorial governments as in the admission of new States, and when the time arrives, the Representatives of the North will be found acting in united phalanx, unwavered by the frowns, unseized by the blandishments of power.

Mr. H., said he had intended to discuss some other topics connected with the present posture of affairs, but want of time would compel him to be brief. Perhaps no greater misfortune can befall a country than to be engaged in a foreign war, conducted by an Executive who does not enjoy the public confidence. Such is our unhappy condition at this time. We are in a most expensive and difficult war, which might have been avoided. We are obliged to intrust its prosecution to an Executive in whom the country reposes a very small share of confidence. Of this there is abundant proof at hand if the fact were disputed. Whilst this want of confidence is a serious aggravation of our difficulties, it is not difficult to account for its existence. The whole conduct of the Administration, both in its domestic measures and its foreign policy, has been contrary to the sober sense and intelligence of the country. I will not dwell upon its visionary experiments in regard to the public finances and the business of the country; the reduction of revenue when an increased need of the restoration of the sub-treasury in the midst of a war; the abandonment of the protective policy, and of all our public improvements. These are matters for discussion on a different occasion.

But look for a moment at the foreign policy of the present Executive. It seems to have been his great effort to cover his designs with a veil of impenetrable mystery. On the Oregon question, when the notice resolution was pending, one portion of his friends believed the President desired the power as a means of asserting and maintaining our title to 540 40', whilst another portion were persuaded that it was to be used as an instrument of the restoration of the sub-treasury in the midst of a war; the abandonment of the protective policy, and of all our public improvements. These are matters for discussion on a different occasion.
growing, planted by a Mexican occupant. The boundary is the very point in dispute; and it is for the country to judge whether Mexico invaded American soil, or our army invaded Mexican soil. The grounds assumed by the President on this subject are alike untenable and contradictory. Whilst he justifies the march to the Rio Grande on the ground that "Texas, under the joint resolution, extends to that river, as a military conquest, taken from Mexico by force of arms. You and I, Mr. Chairman, know very well that Congress never intended to claim title to the Rio Grande. Every form of resolution which recognised the limits claimed in the Texas constitution was rejected by the House; and the resolution finally adopted leaves the boundary an open question, in express terms, and assumes to annex only so much as rightfully belonged to Texas. The east shore of the Rio Grande was in the undisturbed possession of Mexican inhabitants. Texas never possessed it in fact. Mr. Benton, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Van Buren, declared that a treaty annexing it would be an act of war upon Mexico. The joint resolutions were specially framed to prevent a collision with Mexico, and to leave an open door for negotiations.

The first great blunder of the President was his refusal to treat with Mexico respecting the boundary as a separate and distinct question. He insisted on blending it with the claims of our citizens on Mexico, already provided for by treaty. It was virtually saying to Mexico, If you will pay all the claims instant, our boundary is here; if not, it is yonder. It could hardly have been expected that Mexico, already chafed and irritated, would open negotiations on such a basis. No one can doubt that an adjustment of limits would have been followed speedily by a settlement of all other differences. It was our true policy to soothe and pacify, not to exasperate. But it seemed as if there had been a design to present our exactions in a form which no Government could accede to without a feeling of degradation.

It is interesting to observe the progressive character of our territorial claims and pretensions. California is spoken of as already ours, and the question is whether we shall surrender it. He had been quite amazed by the celerity with which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. C. J. Ingersoll] keeps pace with this moveable quality of our title.

Two short years ago, in the debate on the annexation of Texas, he said: "The territorial limits are marked in the configuration of this continent by an Almighty hand. The stupendous deserts between the Nueces and the Bravo are the natural boundary, &c. There ends the valley of the "West, there Mexico begins." In the same speech, he proposed to pay Mexico a round sum of money to secure that desert as a final boundary. In reply to an interrogatory which I addressed to him in a late discussion, I understood him to declare his adherence to the ground then taken; but on examining his report made at the last session, (of which the House has ordered five thousand copies to be printed,) I find he has taken an advanced position. He says: "President Polk had no constitutional right to stop short of the Bravo, and, in truth, the Province of Texas extended to that river by territorial configuration, which nature itself has rendered the liminary demarcation of that region."

Mr. H. had long admired the versatility of that gentleman's genius, and his skill in making "the worse appear the better reason," but he had not suspected those extraordinary and superhuman powers by which the laws of nature are made obedient to his bidding. At one moment he perceives a boundary fixed by "an Almighty hand," but presto! at the touch of his magic wand the line recedes towards the Pacific. He is not to be outdone by the rapid progress of Executive pretensions.

The facility with which he overlaps mountains, and rivers, and deserts, and all natural boundaries whatsoever, is almost incredible, and deserves to be well rewarded. His dexterity in geographical legerdemain, reminds one of Shakespeare's scene of Puck and the fairies, where he exclaims, "I'll put a girdle round about the earth in forty minutes." If the gentleman shall continue to be the organ of the Administration on foreign affairs, the whole continent will be insufficient for the expansion of his views and the rapidity of his progress. On reaching the Pacific, I fear, he will carry the war into Asia, and extend our boundary more rapidly than the victorious arms of Alexander or Genghis Khan.

Perhaps nothing has done more to shock the moral sentiment of the country than the groundless pretences, the perversions of historical fact, and the false coloring of events to which the Administration has had recourse in defence of its proceedings. It leads men to doubt whether virtue and integrity have not departed from the high places of the country.

Mr. H. said he wished to touch upon one or two matters connected with the management of the war, and then he would conclude. It is difficult to determine which is considered the more formidable enemy by the President—the Mexican army, or the American generals. General Scott was the first object of his jealousy. This distinguished commander, whose brilliant services in war and equally successful labors in peace, had won the gratitude and affection of the whole country, after first being designated for the chief command to which he was entitled, and whilst in the midst of his arduous duty of preparation, was suddenly ordered to remain here, and placed under the ban of Executive denunciation. His plan of campaign, which exhibited the delays and obstacles incident to a great military movement, was made the pretext for his condemnation. But months rolled on, and time soon indicated the skill and correctness of his calculations. Mark the progress of events. After the battle of Monterey, it was thought necessary to supersede General Taylor, and General Scott was ordered to take the chief command. His plan of campaign was fully approved, and he departed under the strongest assurances of confidence from the Executive. Will you believe it possible that it was then the intention of the President to send General Scott to Mexico only to supersede and disgrace him? He left this city in November, and had hardly reached the Mexican border, when the
President called on Congress to create a lieutenant general to take the chief command. And we are told by Mr. Benton, that this plan was arranged and agreed on between the President and himself in the month of September, about two months before General Scott was ordered into the field! What shall be said of such gross duplicity and flagrant injustice to a war-worn veteran. Amongst honorable men there can be but one sentiment produced by this display of perfidy "in the highest quarter."

The conduct of the Executive towards General Taylor has been marked by the same want of manliness and magnanimity. To no man living is the Administration so much indebted as to General Taylor. Nothing but his bravery and success saved the war from sinking into utter contempt. He gained a series of victories which excited the gratitude and admiration of the country; and, for the moment, the people almost forgot the nature of the contest in contemplating the glorious achievements of our army. But the President never forgave him the splendor of his success at Monterey. From that moment it was resolved to degrade and supplant him. No gratitude was expressed for the valor and conduct which gained a victory unsurpassed in the annals of modern warfare. On the contrary, the victory was condemned. The terms of capitulation agreed on by General Taylor for the surrender of Monterey, was made the pretence for imposing censure where praise and honor should have been awarded. To destroy the moral effect of the triumph, the armistice was revoked. Time will not permit me to enter upon a statement of facts in defence of the armistice, but a fair examination will satisfy every man that the terms agreed upon were alike wise and honorable. The testimony furnished by the brave and noble Worth, (of whom I cannot speak without emotions of pride and delight,) who bore so leading and distinguished a part in the battle, is perfectly conclusive. The concurrent opinion of the gallant Davis, who acted with him in the negotiations, would of itself be satisfactory. As a member of this House, he was not more distinguished for his military knowledge and intelligence than for his honorable bearing. Ampudia has been put upon trial by his Government for his defeat at Monterey; and General Taylor, equally unfortunate, is required by our puissant Executive to defend his victory. Terms dictated by a regard for the life of his soldiers, are quite too tame for the sanguinary councils of the White House.

From the attacks made here and elsewhere, it is the evident purpose of the Administration and its partisans, to sacrifice the two most prominent generals in command. It is a formidable undertaking for such an Administration. I look forward to the result without apprehension. I have no fear that the American people will suffer the arts and jealousies of scheming politicians to prevail against men whose lives present an unbroken display of bravery, patriotism, and fidelity, in the service of the country.