We are happy to be informed that the personal property—watches, money, &c.—taken from the bodies of sundry passengers who were drowned, was not as was supposed, stolen, but was removed for safe keeping, and will be restored as soon as claimed and identified by persons authorized to receive the same.—*Boston Traveller.*

MESSAGE
OF THE
President of the U. States.
DECEMBER, 1846.

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate
and House of Representatives:

In resuming your labors in the service of the people, it is a subject of congratulation that there has been no period in our past history, when all the elements of national prosperity have been so fully developed.—Since your last session, no afflicting dispensation has visited our country; general good health has prevailed; abundance has crowned the toil of the husbandman; and labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward, while education, science, and the arts are rapidly enlarging the means of social happiness. The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of our territorial limits, and the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy condition of our people is without example in the history of nations.

As the wisdom, strength, and beneficence of our free institutions are unfolded, every day adds fresh motives to contentment, and fresh incentives to patriotism.

Our devout & sincere acknowledgments are due to the gracious Giver of all good, for the numberless blessings which our beloved country enjoys.

It is a source of high satisfaction to know that the relations of the United States with other nations, with a single exception, are of the most amiable character. Sincerely attached to the policy of peace, already adopted and steadily pursued by this government, I have anxiously desired to cultivate and cherish friendship and commerce with every foreign power. The spirit and habits of the American people are favorable to the maintenance of such international harmony. In adhering to this wise policy, a preliminary and paramount duty obviously consists in the protection of our national interests from encroachment or sacrifice, and our national honor from reproach. These must be maintained at any hazard. They admit of no compromise or neglect, and must be scrupulously and constantly guarded. In their vigilant vindication, collision and conflict with foreign powers may sometimes become unavoidable. Such has been our scrupulous adherence to the dictates of justice, in all our foreign intercourse, that though steadily and rapidly advancing in prosperity and power we have given no just cause of complaint to any nation, and have enjoyed the blessings of peace for more than thirty years. From a policy so sacred to humanity, and so salutary in its effects upon our political system, we should never be induced voluntarily to depart.

The existing war with Mexico was neither desired nor provoked by the U. States. On the contrary, all honorable means were resorted to to avert it. After years of endurance of aggravated and unredressed wrongs on our part, Mexico, in violation of solemn treaty stipulations, and of every principle of justice recognized by civilized nations commenced hostilities, and thus by her own act, forced the war upon us. Long before the advance of our army to the left bank of the Rio Grande, we had ample cause of war against Mexico; and had the United States resorted to this extremity, we might have appealed to the whole civilized world for the justice of our cause.

I deem it to be my duty to present to you, on the present occasion, a condensed review of the injuries we had sustained, of the causes which led to the war, and of its progress since its commencement. This is rendered the more necessary because of the misapprehensions which have to some extent prevailed as to its origin and true character. The war has been represented as unjust and unnecessary, and as one of aggression on our part upon a weak and injured enemy. Such erroneous views, though entertained by but few, have been widely and extensively circulated not only at home, but have been spread throughout Mexico and the whole world. A more effectual means could not have been devised to encourage the enemy and protract the war than to advocate and adhere to their cause and thus give them "aid and comfort."

It is a source of national pride and exultation, that the great body of our people have thrown no such obstacles in the way of the government in prosecuting the war successfully, but have shown themselves to be eminently patriotic, and ready to vindicate their country's honor and interests at any sacrifice. The alacrity and promptness with which our volunteer forces rushed to the field on their country's call, prove not only their patriotism, but their deep conviction that our cause is just.

The wrongs which we have suffered from Mexico almost ever since she became an independent Power, and the patient endurance with which we have borne them, are without a parallel in the history of modern civilized nations. There is reason to believe that if these wrongs had been resented and resisted in the first instance, the present war might have been avoided. One outrage, however, permitted to pass with impunity, almost necessarily encouraged the perpetration of another, until at last Mexico seemed to attribute to weakness and indecision on our part a forbearance which was the offspring of magnanimity, and of a sincere desire to preserve friendly relations with a sister republic.

Scarcely had Mexico achieved her independence, which the United States were the first among the nations to acknowledge, when she commenced the system of insult and spoliation, which she has ever since pursued. Our citizens engaged in lawful commerce were imprisoned, their vessels seized, and our flag insulted in her ports. If money was wanted the lawless seizure and confiscation of our merchant vessels and their cargoes was a ready resource; and if to accomplish their purposes it became necessary to imprison the owners, captains, and crews, it was done. Rulers succeeded rulers in Mexico in rapid succession, but still there was no change in this system of depredation. The government of the United States made repeated reclamation on behalf of its citizens, but these were answered by the perpetration of new outrages. Promises of redress made by Mexico in the most solemn forms were postponed or evaded. The files and records of the Department of State contain conclusive proofs of numerous lawless acts perpetrated upon the property and persons of our citizens by Mexico, and of wanton insults to our national flag. The interposition of our government to obtain redress was again and again invoked, under circumstances which no nation ought to disregard.

It was hoped that these outrages would cease, and that Mexico would be restrained by the laws which regulate the conduct of civilized nations in their intercourse with each other after the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation of the fifth April, 1831, was concluded between the two republics; but this hope soon proved to be vain. The course of seizure and confiscation of the property of our citizens, the violation of their persons and the insults to our flag pursued by Mexico previous to that time were scarcely suspended for even a brief period, although the treaty so clearly defines the rights and duties of the respective parties that it is impossible to misunderstand or mistake them. In less than seven years after the conclusion of that treaty our grievances had become so intolerable that, in the opinion of President Jackson, they should no longer be endured.—In his message to Congress in February, 1837, he presented them to the consideration of that body, and declared that "The length of time since some of the injuries have been committed, the repeated and unavailing applications for redress, the wanton character of some of the outrages upon the property and persons of our citizens, upon the officers and flag of the U. States, independent of recent insults to this government and people by the late extraordinary Mexican minister, would justify in the eyes of all nations immediate war." In a spirit of kindness and forbearance, however he recommended reprisals as a milder mode of redress. He declared that war should not be used as a remedy "by just and generous nations confiding in their strength for injuries committed, if it can be honorably avoided," and added, "it has occurred to me that, considering the present embarrassed condition of that country we should act with both wisdom and moderation, by giving Mexico one more opportunity to atone for the past, before we take redress into our own hands. To avoid all misconception on the part of Mexico, as well as to protect our national character from reproach, this opportunity should be given with the avowed design and full preparations to take immediate satisfaction, if it should not be obtained on a repetition of the demand for it. To this end I recommend that an act be passed authorizing reprisals, and the use of the naval force of the United States, by the Executive, against Mexico, to enforce them in the event of a refusal by the Mexican government to come to an amicable adjustment of matters in controversy between us, upon another demand thereof made from on board one of our vessels of war on the coast of Mexico."

Committees of both Houses of Congress, to which this message of the President was referred, fully sustained his views of the character of the wrongs which we had suffered from Mexico, and recommended that another demand for redress should be made before authorising war or reprisals. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, in their report, say: "After such a demand, should prompt justice be refused by the Mexican government, we may appeal to all nations not only for the equity and moderation with which we shall have acted towards a sister republic, but for the necessity which will then compel us to seek redress for our wrongs, either by actual war or by reprisals. The subject will then be presented before Congress, at the commencement of the next session, in a clear and distinct form; and the committee cannot doubt but that such measures will be immediately adopted as may be necessary to vindicate the honor of our country, and insure ample reparation to our injured citizens."

The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives made a similar recommendation. In their report, they say that they "fully concur with the President that ample cause exists for taking redress into our own hands, and believe that we should be justified in the opinion of other nations for taking such a step. But they are willing to try the experiment of another demand, made in the most solemn form, upon the justice of the Mexican government, before any further proceedings are adopted."

No difference of opinion upon the subject is believed to have existed in Congress at that time. The Executive and Legislative departments concurred; and yet such has been our forbearance, and desire to preserve peace with Mexico, that the wrongs of which we then complained, and which gave rise to these solemn proceedings, not only remain undressed to this day, but additional causes of complaint, of an aggravated character, have ever since been accumulating.

Shortly after these proceedings, a special messenger was despatched to Mexico, to make a final demand for redress; and on the twentieth of July, 1837, the demand was made. The reply of the Mexican government bears date on the twenty-ninth of the same month, and contains the assurances of the "anxious wish" of the Mexican government "not to delay the moment of that final and equitable adjustment which is to terminate the existing difficulties between the two governments;" that "nothing should be left undone which may contribute to the most speedy and equitable determination of the subjects which have so seriously engaged the attention of the American government;" that the "Mexican government would adopt, as the only guides for its conduct, the plainest principles of public right, the sacred obligations imposed by international law, and the religious faith of treaties;" and that "whatever reason and justice may dictate respecting each case will be done." The assurance was further given, that the decision of the Mexican government upon each cause of complaint, for which redress had been demanded, should be communicated to the government of the United States by the Mexican minister at Washington.

These solemn assurances, in answer to our demand for redress, were disregarded. By making them, however, Mexico obtained further delay. President Van Buren, in his annual message to Congress of the fifth of December, 1837, states, that "although the larger number" of our demands for redress, and "many of them aggravated cases of personal wrongs, have been now for years before the Mexican government, and some of the causes of national complaint, and those of the most offensive character, admitted of immediate, simple, and satisfactory replies, it is only within a few days past that any specific communication in answer to our last demand, made five months ago, has been received from the Mexican minister;" and that "for not one of our public complaints has satisfaction been given or offered; that but one of the cases of personal wrong has been favorably considered, and that but four cases of both descriptions, out of all those formally presented, and earnestly pressed, have as yet been decided upon by the Mexican government."

President Van Buren, believing that it would be vain to make any further attempt to obtain redress by the ordinary means within the power of the Executive, communicated this opinion to Congress, in the message referred to, in which he said, "On a careful and deliberate examination of the contents" (of the correspondence with the Mexican government,) "and considering the spirit manifested by the Mexican government, it has become my painful duty to return the subject as it now stands, to Congress, to whom it belongs, to decide upon the time, the mode, and the measure of redress.

Had the United States at that time adopted compulsory measures, and taken redress into their own hands, all our difficulties with Mexico would probably have been long since adjusted and the existing war have been averted. Magnanimity and moderation on our part only had the effect to complicate these difficulties, and render an amicable settlement of them the more embarrassing. That such measures of redress under similar provocations, committed by any of the powerful nations of Europe, would have been promptly resorted to by the United States, cannot be doubted. The national honor, and the preservation of the national character throughout the world, as well as our own self-respect, and the protection due to our own citizens, would have rendered such a resort indispensible.

The history of no civilized nation in modern times has presented within so brief a period so many wanton attacks upon the honor of its flag and upon the persons and property of its citizens, as had at that time been borne by the United States from the Mexican authorities and people. But Mexico was a sister republic, on the North American continent occupying a territory contiguous to our own, and was in a feeble and distracted condition; and these considerations it is presumed, induced Congress to forbear still longer.

Instead of taking redress into our own hands, a new negotiation was entered upon with fair promises on the part of Mexico, but with the real purpose, as the event has proved of indefinitely postponing the reparation which we demanded, and which was so justly due. This negotiation, after more than a year's delay, resulted in the convention of the eleventh of April 1839, "for the adjustment of claims of citizens of the United States of America upon the government of the Mexican republic." The joint board of commissioners created by this convention to examine and decide upon these claims was not organized until the month of August 1810, and under the terms of the convention they were to terminate their duties within eighteen months from that time.

Four of the eighteen months were consumed in preliminary discussions on frivolous and dilatory points raised by the Mexican commissioners; and it was not until the month of December, 1810, that they commenced the examination of the claims of our citizens upon Mexico. Fourteen months only remained to examine and decide upon these numerous and complicated cases. In the month of February 1852, the term of the commission expired leaving many claims undisposed of for want of time.

The claims which were allowed by the board, and by the umpire authorised by the convention to decide in case of disagreement between the Mexican and American commissioners, amounted to two million twenty-six thousand one hundred and thirty-nine dollars and sixty-eight cents.—There were pending before the umpire when the commission expired additional claims which had been examined and awarded by the American commissioners, and had not been allowed by the Mexican commissioners, amounting to nine hundred and twenty eight thousand six hundred and twenty seven dollars and eighty eight cents upon which he did not decide, alleging that his authority had ceased with the termination of the joint commission.

Besides these claims, there were others of American citizens amounting to three million three hundred and thirty six thousand eight hundred and thirty seven dollars and five cents, which had been submitted to the board, and upon which they had not time to decide before their final adjournment.

The sum of two millions twenty six thousand one hundred and thirty nine dollars & sixty eight cents which had been awarded to the claimants, was a liquidated and ascertained debt due by Mexico about which there could be no dispute, and which she was bound to pay according to the terms of the convention. Soon after the final awards for this had been made, the Mexican government asked for a postponement of the time of making payment, urging that it would be inconvenient for her to make payment at the time stipulated. In the spirit of forbearing kindness towards a sister republic, which Mexico has so long abused, the United States promptly complied with her request.

A second convention was accordingly concluded between the two governments on the thirtieth of January, 1843, which upon its face declares, that "this new arrangement is entered into for the accommodation of Mexico." By the terms of this convention, all the interest due on the awards which had been made in favor of the claimants under the convention of the eleventh of April 1839, was to be paid to them on the thirtieth of April, 1843, and "the principal of the said awards and the interest accruing thereon," was stipulated to "be paid in five years, in equal instalments every three months."

Notwithstanding this new convention was entered into at the request of Mexico and for the purpose of relieving her from embarrassment, the claimants have only received the interest due on the thirtieth of April, 1843, and three of the twenty instalments. Although the payment of the sum thus liquidated, and confessedly due by Mexico to our citizens as indemnity for acknowledged acts of outrage and wrong, was secured by treaty the obligations of which are ever held sacred by all just nations yet Mexico has violated this solemn engagement by failing and refusing to make the payment. The two instalments due in April and July, 1844, under the peculiar circumstances connected with them, have been assumed by the United States and discharged to the claimants—but they are still due by Mexico.

But this is not all of which we have just cause of complaint. To provide a remedy for the claimants whose cases were not decided by the joint commission under the convention of April the eleventh, 1839, it was expressly stipulated by the sixth article of the convention of the thirtieth of January, 1843, that "a new convention shall be entered into for the settlement of all claims of the government and citizens of the United States against the republic of Mexico which were not finally decided by the late commission, which met in the city of Washington, and of all claims of the government and citizens of Mexico against the United States.

In conformity with this stipulation, a third convention was concluded and signed at the city of Mexico on the twentieth of November 1843 by the plenipotentiaries of the two governments, by which provision was made for ascertaining and paying these claims. In January, 1844, this convention was ratified by the Senate of the United States with two amendments, which were manifestly reasonable in their character. Upon a reference of the amendments proposed to the government of Mexico, the same evasions, differences and delays were interposed which have so long marked the policy of that government towards the United States. It has not even yet decided whether it would or would not accede to them, although the subject has been repeatedly pressed upon its consideration.

Mexico has thus violated a second time the faith of treaties; by failing or refusing to carry into effect the sixth article of the convention of January 1843.

Such is the history of the wrongs which we have suffered and patiently endured from Mexico through a long series of years. So far from affording reasonable satisfaction for the injuries and insults we had borne a great aggravation of them consists in the fact, that while the United States, anxious to preserve a good understanding with Mexico have been constantly, but vainly, employed in seeking redress for past wrongs, new outrages were constantly occurring which have continued to increase our causes of complaint and to swell the amount of our demands. While the citizens of the U. States were conducting a lawful commerce with Mexico under the guaranty of a treaty of "amity, commerce and navigation," many of them have suffered all the injuries which would have resulted from open war.

This treaty, instead of affording protection to our citizens, has been the means of inviting them into the ports of Mexico that they might be, as they have been in numerous instances, plundered of their property and deprived of their personal liberty if they dared insist on their rights.—Had the unlawful seizures of American property, and the violation of personal liberty of our citizens, to say nothing of the insults to our flag which have occurred in the ports of Mexico, taken place on the high seas they would themselves long since have constituted a state of actual war between the two countries.

In so long suffering Mexico to violate her most solemn treaty obligations, plunder our citizens of their property, and imprison their persons without affording them any redress, we have failed to perform one of the first and highest duties which every government owes to its citizens and the consequence has been, that many of them have been reduced from a state of affluence to bankruptcy. The proud name of American citizen, which ought to protect all who bear it from insult and injury throughout the world, has afforded no such protection to our citizens in Mexico. We had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities. But even then we forebore to take redress into our own hands, until Mexico herself became the aggressor by invading our soil in hostile array, and shedding the blood of our citizens.

Such are the grave causes of complaint on the part of the United States against Mexico—causes which existed long before the annexion of Texas to the American Union; and yet, animated by the love of peace, and a magnanimous moderation, we did not adopt those measures of redress which under such circumstances are the justified resort of injured nations.

The annexation of Texas to the United States constituted no just cause of offence to Mexico. The pretext that it did so is wholy inconsistent, and irreconcilable with well authenticated facts connected with the revolution by which Texas became independent of Mexico. That this may be the more manifest, it may be proper to advert to the causes and to the history of the principal events of that revolution.

Texas constituted a portion of the ancient province of Louisiana, ceded to the United States by France in the year 1803. In the year 1819, the United States, by the Florida tready, ceded to Spain all that part of Louisiana within the present limits of Texas; and Mexico, by the revolution which separated her from Spain, and rendered her an independent nation, succeeded to the rights of the mother country over this territory. In the year 1824, Mexico established a federal constitution, under which the Mexican republic was composed of a number of sovereign States, confederated together in a federal Union similar to our own.

Each of these States had its own Executive, legislature and judiciary, and for all, except federal purposes, was as independent of the general government, and that of the other States, as Pennsylvania or Virginia under our constitution. Texas and Coahuila united and formed one of these Mexican States. The State constitution which they adopted, and which was approved by the Mexican confederacy, asserted that they were "free and independent of the other Mexican United States, and of every other power and dominion whatsoever," and proclaimed the great principle of human liberty, that "the sovereignty of the State resides originally and essentially in the general mass of the individuals who compose it." To the government under this constitution, as well as to that under the federal constitution, the people of Texas owed allegiance.

Emigrants from foreign countries, including the United States, were invited by the colonization laws of the State and of the federal government to settle in Texas.—Advantageous terms were offered to induce them to leave their own country and become Mexican citizens. This invitation was accepted by many of our citizens, in the full faith that in their new home they would be governed by laws enacted by representatives elected by themselves, and that their lives, liberty, and property would be protected by constitutional guarantees similar to those which existed in the republic they had left. Under a government thus organized they continued until the year 1835, when a military revolution broke out in the city of Mexico, which entirely subverted the federal and State constitutions, and placed a military dictator at the head of the government.

By a sweeping decree of Congress subservient to the will of the dictator; the several state constitutions were abolished, and the States themselves converted into mere departments of the General Government.—The people of Texas were unwilling to submit to this usurpation. Resistance to such tyranny became a high duty. Texas was fully absolved from all allegiance to the Central Government of Mexico from the movement that government had abolished her State constitution, and in its place substituted an arbitrary and despotic Central Government.

Such were the principal causes of the Texan revolution. The people of Texas at once determined upon resistance, and flew to arms. In the midst of these important and exciting events, however, they did not omit to place their liberties upon a secure and permanent foundation. They elected members to a convention, who, in the month of March, 1836, issued a formal declaration that their "political connexion with the Mexican nation has forever ended, and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign, and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations." They also adopted for their government a liberal republican constitution. About the same time Santa Anna, then the dictator of Mexico, invaded Texas with a numerous army for the purpose of subduing her people and enforcing obedience to his arbitrary and despotic government. On the twenty-first of April, 1836, he was met by the Mexican citizen-soldiers, and on that day was achieved by them the memorable victory of San Jacinto, by which they conquered their independence. Considering the numbers engaged on the respective sides, history does not record a more brilliant achievement. Santa Anna himself was among the captives.

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

From the day that the battle of San Jacinto was fought until the present hour, Mexico has never possessed the power to reconquer Texas. In the language of the Secretary of State of the United States, in a despatch to our minister in Mexico, under date of the eighth of July, 1842, "Mexico may have chosen to consider, and may still choose to consider Texas as having been at all times since 1835, and is still continuing, a rebellious province; but the world has been obliged to take a very different view of the matter. From the time of the battle of San Jacinto, in April, 1836, to the present moment, Texas has exhibited the same external signs of national independence as Mexico herself, and with quite as much stability of Government.

Practically free and independent, acknowledged as a political sovereignty by the principal Powers of the world, no hostile foot finding rest within her territory for six or seven years, and Mexico herself refraining for all that period from any further attempt to re-establish her own authority over the territory, it cannot but be surprising to find Mr. de Cocanegra, (the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico,) "complaining that for that whole period citizens of the United States, or its government, have been favoring the rebels of Texas, and supplying them with vessels, ammunition, and money, as if the war for the reduction of the province of Texas had been constantly prosecuted by Mexico, and her success prevented by these influences from abroad." In the same despatch the Secretary of State affirms that "since 1837 the United States have regarded Texas as an independent sovereignty, as much as Mexico; and that trade and commerces with citizens or a government at war with Mexico can not, on that account, be regarded as an intercouse by which assistance and succor are given to Mexican rebels. The whole current of Mr. de Bocanegra's remarks runs in the same direction as if the independence of Texas had not been acknowledged. It was acknowledged in 1837 against the remonstrance and protest of Mexico; and most of the acts of any importance, of which Mr. de Bocanegra complains, flow necessarily from that recognition. He speaks of Texas as still being 'an integral part of the territory of the Mexican republic,' but he cannot but understand that the United States do not so regard it. The real complaint of Mexico, therefore, is, in substance, neither more nor less than a complaint against the recognition of Texas independence. It may be thought rather late to repeat that complaint, and not quite just to confine it to the United States, to the exemption of England, France, and Belgium, unless the U. States, having been the first to acknowledge the independence of Mexico herself, are to be blamed for setting an example for the recognition of that of Texas." And he added, that "the constitution, public treaties, and the laws oblige the President to regard Texas as an independent State, and its territory as no part of the territory of Mexico." Texas had been an independent State, with an organized government, defying the power of Mexico to overthrow or reconquer her, for more than ten years before Mexico commenced the present war against the United States. Texas had given such evidence to the world of her ability to maintain her separate existence as an independent nation, that she been formally recognised as such, not only by the United States, but by several of the principal powers of Europe.

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

But there are those who, conceding all this to be true, assume the ground that the western boundary of Texas is the Nueces, instead of the Rio Grande; and that, therefore, in marching our army to the east bank of the latter river, we passed the Texan line, and invaded the territory of Mexico. A simple statement of facts, known to exist, will conclusively refute such an assumption. Texas, as ceded to the United States by France in 1803, has been always claimed as extending west to the Rio Grande, or Rio Bravo. This fact is established by the authority of our most eminent statesmen at a period when the question was as well if not better understood than it is at present. During Mr. Jefferson's administration, Messrs. Monroe and Pinckney, who had been sent on a special mission to Madrid, charged, among other things, with the adjustment of boundary between the two countries, in a note addressed to the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs, under date of the 28th of January, 1835, assert that the boundaries of Louisiana, as ceded to the United States by France, "are the river Perdido on the east, and the river Bravo on the West;" and they add, that "the facts and principles which justify this conclusion are so satisfactory to our government as to convince it that the United States have not a better right to the island of New Orleans, under the cession referred to, than they have to the whole district of territory which is above described."

Down to the conclusion of the Florida treaty, in February, 1819, by which this territory was ceded to Spain, the United States asserted and maintained their territorial rights to this extent. In the month of June, 1818, during Mr. Monroe's administration, information having been received that a number of foreign adventurers had landed at Galveston, with the avowed pur-