

subject of the annexation of Texas, and Texas with these transactions, at any error that they are received were interesting still. Therefore an account of the proposed annexation. This will of the people, expression of opposition was with the desires for a considerable was no hope ordered the annexation. In Texas had been. In December, came into power, address, denounced was not revived, measures taken for treaty was negated in which the late dollars to England; and if the term was employed, it was in reference to the United States, but not to England. It was not applicable to the relations of Texas and England, and would but apply to our relations with the United States. It had become necessary to operate upon the apprehensions and jealousies of the United States; to give them to exertion; and no other course was well calculated to attain that object as to speak England in terms of commendation. The then existing administration of Texas had commenced under the most unfavorable auspices, and found the country in a most lamentable condition. The institutions of the country were in chaos without means, without defences; hundreds of citizens prisoners in the dungeons of Mexico; confidence between man and man destroyed; the government not respected; no sympathies from abroad; an Indian war raging on our borders; Mexico ready to invade us from the Rio Grande; the seaboard undefended; the navy in foreign service; several of our counties in civil war, and open resistance to the laws; and without five hundred pounds power and lead to defend our soil. Under these circumstances had application been presented for admission into the Union. How different were the circumstances under which annexation was consummated! Texas had assumed a more imposing attitude. She had realized a currency composed of the precious metals; peace had been restored with the Indians; our citizens released from prison; our internal condition was orderly, and the law restored; at peace with Mexico, and our independence recognised by that power; the seaboard free from invasion; Texas tranquil, and respected by other nations. It was in this condition that she became an integral part of the United States. She did not enter this Union as a suppliant. No. The last offer for annexation was made by the United States, by Texas. Texas was more coy than forward. The overture was received with as much coyness as her part as the United States had previously proceeded towards her. I have said, Mr. President,

that she was not a suppliant. She came into this confederacy as a sovereign and independent State. She brought with her as warm attachments to republican institutions as those of any other State represented in this chamber. If she did not make her advent with all the paraphernalia of bridal array, she brought a nation for her dowry, and the hearts of freemen for her jewels.

In the course of this debate the subject of war has been adverted to with its demoralizing influence and desolating consequences. It was a maxim of the venerable Macon that war was necessary to such a government as ours at least once in every thirty years. I hope that condition of things has run out with us, and that wisdom will obviate the necessity for many years to come. Yet war may sometimes be productive of good; it may be a means of ridding a community of restless and turbulent spirits whom nothing can govern but the iron rod of military rule. It embodies such men at last, and places them in a situation where, if they are not killed off, they must submit to control, and are rendered subordinate to law; and if they should survive the dangers of battle, they return better members of the community. War has its evils, but not to the extent, or of the character, imagined and described by an honorable senator. The last war of the United States was not entirely productive of evil; on the contrary, it called forth the energies of the people, and advanced us in the march of improvement at a rate unexampled in the history of mankind. It was, no doubt, one of the agents employed in developing the resources of American mind and enterprise.

I am far, however, from advocating war as a principle of this government. I desire peace, where there is a prospect of its proving more advantageous than war. I would rather remain a little stationary than to run the hazards of war. But while I admit that peace ought to be pursued and cultivated, I hold another great principle of government, and that is, always to resist oppression. If, to maintain this principle, war should become necessary, I would endure it. War, with all the evils attendant in its train, is preferable to national degradation, or the loss of empire. What people ever remained free that did not pay a price for their freedom? The government has to be supported at every hazard; and if, in doing this, war should come upon us, we must meet it as a necessary evil. As for the pernicious influence apprehended from generals who have successfully led the armies of their country, I cannot assent to it. If admitted, it would be an argument against war under any circumstances. Men as pure and patriotic as any of those who have filled civil stations have achieved victories, and secured liberty to mankind, and passed off without abuse of their power.

The history of those who led the revolutionary armies of America afford evidence of the truth of my assertion; for when they had conquered in the field they voluntarily laid down their command, and submitted to the civil authorities of the country. They co-operated with their influence and power, to create and establish, but not to overturn, constitutional government.

What did the military leaders, who have filled the presidential chair, to justify such apprehension? Whatever may be thought of the policy of the last greatly distinguished military leader who occupied that station, or whether that policy was right or wrong, it cannot be denied that after defending his country in war, he left it in peace, prosperous and