

EDITED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
TUESDAY MORNING.

By George W. Sherwood.

TERMS.—Two dollars and fifty cents per
annum payable within the year. No sub-
scription will be discontinued until all ar-
rerges are settled, without the approbation of
the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding a square
inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-
five cents for every subsequent insertion
larger ones in the same proportion.
All communications to insure attention,
should be post paid if sent by mail.
Postmasters will please give us prompt
notice of any refusal to take the paper from
their office.

POET'S CORNER.

THE PRINTER'S SONG.

Print, comrades, print—a noble task,
Is the one we daily ply;
'Tis our's to tell to all who ask,
The wonders of earth and sky;
We catch the thought all glowing warm,
As it leaves the student's brain,
And place the stamp of enduring fame
On Poet's airy strain.
Then let us sing as we nimbly fling
The slender letters round;
A glorious thing is our laboring;
Oh! where may its like be found?
Ever limned in painter's dream,
The fairest form e'er sculptor wrought,
By the light of beauty's gleam,
Though lovely, may not match the power,
Which our proud ART can claim:
That links the past with the present hour,
And its breath—the voice of fame,
Then let us sing as we nimbly fling, &c.

Print, comrades, print—God hath ordained
That man by his toil should live;
Then spurn the charge, that we disdain'd
The labor God would give;
We envy not the sons of ease,
Nor the lord in princely hall;
But bow before the wise decrees
In kindness meant for all.
Then let us sing as we nimbly fling, &c.

Communication.

THE "REVIEWER" REVIEWED.

It has been remarked, and very justly
too, that the who attempts to criticise on
the efforts of others, in this day of general in-
formation, must either be a very wise man or a
concocted fool. Partaking somewhat of the
above remark, appeared a wise acorn (the
younger of a certain clique, styled by some
the hieratic of the Bay-side) in the well con-
ducted *Gazette*, occupying by
its bits, for two successive issues,
the proof of his (their) real
feelings was received by us with
feelings that would have
the return of long lost
no longer expected to see
us, we sincerely re-
joice, both for his sake,

for as well as too
ought, at any
his memory.
Year since we were
gigantic and gigan-
were put up within the
cranium, and we have
to that he could write and
speak so well, should have written and
spoken so little. From that time till
the present we have heard little or nothing from
him, and in our surmises had come to the
wild conclusion, that in a great measure, he
had been lost sight of by the public as well
as by us. But with a singular and an un-
pardonable indifference to fame, as a critic,
he has remained this long interval in in-
dolent and patient repose, and without
making a single movement to maintain (save
by borrowing trash) the reputation he had
acquired as a scholar; has permitted the
less competent to usurp the attention which
he was sure of commanding, and allowed
himself to be nearly forgotten by a public
which reckon on being reminded of all the
claims which the living have on their fa-
vors.

His former efforts, though of great mod-
esty and cunning among his clique, were
of too trifling a nature to command gen-
eral attention, and seem, by some accident,
to have been jostled aside by the crowd of
more ready ones to do justice to the liv-
ing. Though his name has not hitherto
been very common in the mouths of other
critics, yet we believe there are a few real
lovers of merit, to whom some of his sen-
timents and descriptions are not scarcely
familiar. There is a force and some truth
in many of his notions of rustic life (ani-
mal comparisons) which are calculated to
sink deep in the memory; and being con-
firmed by daily observation by him, they
are recalled upon all occasions, when the
pictures of more fanciful authors are all
lost sight of by his frequent allusions to
their true interest. For our part, we are
greatly indebted to him for many of those
strong impressions, and have known many
of our friends to declare that they could not
pass by the young fool without wondering
how lavish nature has been in filling his
cranium with so much knowledge! without
giving proper secret augurs to enable him
to grope his way through life without the
assistance of proffered friends, and prevent
his being thrown away like other rubbish,
entire and unregretted.

The piece now before us will, we hope,
renew and extend more favorable impres-
sions elsewhere; it having failed, signally
failed, in its design in this immediate Dis-
trict. It contains all the venom of its no-
toriously young but pedantic writer (for
author he cannot be called) with about dou-
ble its bulk of new matter, most of it in the
same taste with his former habits, though
previous to this miscarriage we discovered
none of this feeling in the writer. The
whole having been gotten up to produce a
certain effect; we can excuse the Doctor
(for by the by he is a Doctor too) for wear-
ing two faces. The whole however, as a
literary affair, is of no ordinary merit, and

will we think place him before the coun-
try as the most original, nervous and pa-
thetic writer of the present century. His
fort certainly is force, though he lacks true
description, and for the most part is too
fond of selection and condensation of ex-
pression. That kind of strength we object
too; it would have been more in keeping
with the preface to have criticised *seriatim*,
and not take a line here and there, that
the most ignorant blockhead on earth
could have done—by destroying the sense,
by committing errors in the transcribing,
as it evidently shows in several parts when
compared with the original. If he had
been as particular in the paraphrasing as
he was in the preface, we would have omit-
ted every thing which is superfluous, and at-
tributed it to the printer's blunders, in-
stead of which he is known to possess. We pre-
sume, however, that while transcribing, the
retina of the eye became clouded and ob-
scured the sight, and having left his spees
in the lower story of the large brick build-
ing, he was prevented from seeing with
clearness objects at a distance, though 'tis
said "that distance lends enchantment to
the view."

If it is said that he imitated the manner
and style of any other writer, it is indeed
our, who to our knowledge, has slept and
is still snoring away to most of the present
generation. This way of arousing up the
dead to suit the whims and purposes of the
living we object to; for 'tis said "that we
should tread lightly on their ashes." But
his general train of thinking, and his views
of society, may intelligence, are extremely
offensive and at war with most persons;
particularly those who do not think with
him in reference to amiability and intelli-
gence. And while it must be admitted that
he is superior in the fine finish and uni-
form beauty of his person, and composition,
yet we cannot view him otherwise than as
a pigmy in the world of literature, exhib-
iting more than double his real size by a
double covering of vanity and spleen. For
instead of that uniform tint of pensive
tenderness which envelopes the whole man
like a great coat, we sometimes find in him
an occasional gleam of gaiety and humor;
and his habitual views of life are more
pious than most of his contemporaries.
When the occasions of sorrow and
rebuffs are gone by, he can collect himself
for sarcastic pleasure, and ascend into
some vague notions of intelligence with a
distateless, serious and less fastidious
opinion of some, a deeper eye for obser-
vation and a reader's hand for delineation
of what he in his Solomonish wisdom has
observed, and thought proper, *by aid*, to
consider.

There is certainly some poetical thinking
in this last performance, but the manner
in which it is groped together and conceived,
we think (and we are not alone) exhibits
less genius, and is drawn with less spirit
than any other written performance of his
that we are acquainted with, except one po-
etical effort that he addressed to a young
lady, written over the signature of another man,
which was unceremoniously used without his
knowledge or consent. It is not quite fair,
perhaps, to draw a detailed parallel between
a living being whose cadaverous appearance
is any thing but prepossessing, yet there are
so few contemporaries of the pen that bear
any resemblance to him, that we can scarce-
ly draw ours (and the community's) with-
out comparing him to a certain quadruped
that resides within the circumference of his
evening walks. To our mind the compar-
ison is good and just, with the single excep-
tion that the older of the two is rather near-
sighted, and wears the smaller ears. There
is a force and justness in the representation,
which is entitled to something more than in-
dulgence; and though several of the groups
are composed of low and disagreeable sub-
jects, still, we think, that some allowance
might be made for the author's plan of giv-
ing a full and exact view of life without re-
membering some of his former associates.

We admit, however, that there is some
carelessness too, as well as quaintness in
this effort, for he has now and then appar-
ently heaped up circumstances rather to gratify
his own taste for detail and accommodation,
than to give any additional effect to his
description. At first we were disposed to
laugh at the credulity of human nature, by
giving vent to one of those loud and strong
singing peals that has of late tended so much
to relieve our hypochondriac musings, and
afford us much personal gratification. But
it seems that he was laughing at our suppo-
sed death, and assuming to himself the tal-
ent of being able to guide when he should
have been only *seducer*. We are informed
by the "knowing ones" that his head has
been felt by phrenologists, and that the bump
of self-esteem was so largely developed that
it may be felt with a stick, (as some do the
pulse) and were admonished to keep quiet;
and assured that the base of the superstruc-
ture being too small, it would by the laws of
gravity whirl him headlong down among
other rubbish lost to things on earth.
Now should this literati ever expect to be-
come a critic, by head or by pen, we, in our
charity, would advise him to read a very in-
teresting dissertation on the "uncertainty of
human expectations." And we hope, and
it doubtless will, close up the last avenue of
hope that he possesses of ever becoming the
Walpole of America. For we can assure
him, with a sorrowful heart, that the com-
mons of literature are too closely grazed by
such writers; it would therefore be better for
him to hold his peace till it springs up anew,
and then he will have ample time to cut a
great and full swarth.

We give these remarks in no spirit of un-
kindness, for to be angry would little our
own character; but simply to admonish him
of the necessity of keeping quiet. For all
the missiles that he may hurl will be of no
avail. He (they) being a christian, that is,
a member of the church, we would recom-
mend to his especial notice the fifteenth
chapter of St. John's Gospel, and when he

digests it perfectly, probably he will adhere
in future to the tenets of the church with the
same closeness that Cantharides does to the
"cuticular," and save us the mortification of
speaking of him in a more prolix and feeling
manner, and from the trouble of covering his
muscular "contaminability," as we certainly shall
do if called on to give a rejoinder, that shall
tell with all the force of a thunderbolt.
St. Michaels, April 10th, 1844.

ANNEXATION.

Mr. Van Buren's Letter.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLOBE.]

House of Representatives,

April 27th, 1844.

SIR: The inclosed letter from Mr. Van
Buren, which I have this day received, in
reference to a matter on which the public
mind is at present much excited, I beg that
you will immediately publish in the Globe.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

W. H. HAMMET.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 27th, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR: Under the belief that it is
the right of every free citizen, in a free gov-
ernment, to know the opinions of those
who aspire to public station, upon great
public questions, as one of your warmest
supporters in 1836 and 1840, and as an un-
pledged delegate to the Baltimore conven-
tion, I desire particularly to know your
opinions as to the constitutionality and ex-
pediency of immediately annexing Texas
to the United States, so soon as the con-
sent of Texas may be had to such annex-
ation.

The letters of Mr. Webster and General
Jackson on this subject—the refusal of the
legislature of Kentucky to pass approba-
tory resolutions—the votes taken in the
legislatures of Pennsylvania, New York,
and, as I am just informed, Maine—and the
impression that Mr. Clay will oppose the
annexation, give great importance to your
opinions.

It is believed that a full and frank de-
claration from you, favorable to this object,
will be of great service to the cause at a
moment so critical of its destiny; and
should you recognize my right to inquire,
and your duty to answer, I shall be greatly
obliged to you for a letter setting forth your
opinions, and the reasons for them.

annexation, I will, on account of the
great effect it must have on the issue of
this question, give it early publicity; and
if otherwise, that I will publish it only in
time that your opinions may be fully
known before the action of the Baltimore
convention; unless you require its im-
mediate publication—in which event I will
also comply with your request.

Pardon me for suggesting that, should
your opinions be favorable to annexation,
the weight and influence of those opinions
will be doubly enhanced in the estimation
of all true friends of the measure, by the
earliest possible public avowal of them be-
fore the country.

I am, sir, with great respect,

Truly your friend and ob't serv't.

W. H. HAMMET.

Hon. M. VAN BUREN,

Lindenwald, New York.

LINDENWALD, April 20, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 27th
of March last was duly received.

Acting as an unpledged delegate to the
Baltimore convention, you ask my opinion
in regard to the constitutionality and ex-
pediency of an immediate annexation of Tex-
as to the United States, or as soon as the
assent of Texas may be had to such annex-
ation. Upon the receipt of your letter, I
caused you to be forthwith informed that
your request should be complied with in
full season for the convention. This
promise I shall now perform. But, lest
my motives in making a public avowal of
my opinions, whilst a negotiation is sus-
pended to be pending, should be misconstrued,
I shall send this to a friend who will
delay its delivery as long as that can be
done consistently with a faithful compli-
ance with the requirements of your letter,
and the general objects for which it was
written.

You by no means overrate the impor-
tance of the subject upon which you have
been pleased to address me. It is not only
a question of intense interest to every
part of the country, but is unhappily also
one in regard to which we may not promise
ourselves that unanimity of opinions
which is so important when great national
questions like this are to be decided. That
those which I am about to express will, in
at least one important particular, differ from
that of many friends, political and personal,
whose judgements and purity of views
I hold in high and habitual respect, I can
well imagine; and it is quite evident, from
the tenor of your letter, that they will not
in all respects correspond with your own.
If, however, such of my fellow-citizens as
are neither influenced by prejudices, nor
warped by self-interest, concede to my
opinions the merits of having been formed
under views directed to the preservation
and advancement of the honor and best in-
terests of our common country, as a whole,
and expressed with a sincerity which has
been overlooked, as far as our feeble nat-
ures will permit us to do, all personal con-
siderations, my most favorable anticipations
will be realized.

It has already been made my duty to ac-

officially on at least two several occasions
but in different forms, upon the subject-matter
to which your questions have refer-
ence.
Having charge of the Department of State
in 1823, I prepared, by direction of the
President, instructions to our minister at
Mexico, by which he was directed to open,
without delay, a negotiation with the Mex-
ican government for the purchase of the
greater part of the then province of Texas;
and which he was likewise authorized to
insert in the treaty a provision similar to
that in the Louisiana and Florida treaties,
for the incorporation of the inhabitants of
Texas into the Union as soon as it could
be done consistently with the principles
of territorial constitution. The reasons
of the measure I stated at large in a
document.

In making this step, the administration of
President Jackson renewed (but, as was
supposed, under favorable circumstances)
an attempt to accomplish the same object
which had been made by its immediate
predecessor. Instructions, similar in their
general object, had, in the second year of
the later administration; been sent from
the Department of State to the same Amer-
ican Minister at Mexico. I am not aware
that there were any material differences be-
tween them, other than those of 1827 pro-
posed an acquisition of territory as far west
as the Rio del Norte—being, I believe, the
extreme western boundary of Texas—
whilst the cession asked for by President
Jackson extended only as far west as the
centre of the Desert or Grand Prairie,
which lies east of the river Nueces; and
that, for the former, the payment of one
million of dollars was authorized, whilst,
by the administration of President Jack-
son, the American minister was permitted
to go as high as four, and, if indispensable,
five millions. Both authorized agreements
for smaller portions of territory, and the
payments were modified accordingly. In
respect to the proposed stipulation for the
ultimate incorporation of the inhabitants
into the Union, both instructions were
identical.

In August, 1837, a proposition was re-
ceived at the Department of State, from the
Mexican minister at Washington, proposing
a negotiation for the annexation of Texas
to the United States. This was the first
time the question of annexation of a for-
eign independent State had ever presented
itself to this government. In deciding upon
it, I did not find it necessary to consider the
question of constitutional power, nor
the manner in which the object should be
accomplished, if deemed expedient and
proper. Both these points were therefore
in terms, passed over in the reply of the
Secretary of State to the Texan minister,
as subjects the consideration of which had
not been entered upon by the executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional
power—is now presented by your inquiry;
not, however, in precisely the same
form. Then the application was for the
immediate admission of Texas into the
Union as an independent State; your ques-
tion looks only to its annexation as part
of the territory of the United States. There
is no express power given to any depart-
ment of the government to purchase terri-
tory except for the objects specified in the
constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the
power has, on several very important occa-
sions, been regarded as embraced in the
treaty-making power; and territories have
been so annexed with a view and under
engagements for their ultimate admission
into the Union as States. If there be no-
thing in the situation or condition of the
territory of Texas, which would render its
admission hereafter into the Union as a new
State improper, I cannot perceive any ob-
jection, on constitutional grounds, to its
annexation as a territory. In speaking of
the right to admit new States, I must, of
course, be understood as referring to the
Senate of Congress. The executive and
State may, as I have already observed,
by the exercise of the treaty-making power,
acquire territory; but new States can
be admitted by Congress; and the
authority over the subject, which is
given to it by the constitution, is contained
in the following provision, viz: "New States
may be admitted by the Congress into this
Union." The only restrictions imposed
upon this general power are, 1st: That no
new States shall be formed or erected
within the jurisdiction of any other State,
nor 2ndly, "Any State formed by the
junction of two or more States, or parts
of States, without the consent of the Leg-
islature concerned, as well as of Congress."

—restrictions which have no bearing upon
the present question. The matter, there-
fore, stands as it would do if the constitu-
tion said "new States may be admitted by
Congress into this Union," without addi-
tion or restriction. That these words,
taken by themselves, are broad enough to
authorize the admission of the Territory
of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted;
nor do I perceive upon what principle we
can set up limitations to a power so un-
qualified recognised by the constitution in
the plain simple words I have quoted, and
with which no other provision of that in-
strument conflicts in the slightest degree.
But if, with no other guides than our own
discretion, we assume limitations upon a
power so general, we are at least bound to
give to them some intelligible and definite
character. The most natural, and indeed
the only one of that nature has been
suggested, and which was presented by
Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts

did not find it necessary to consider the
question of constitutional power, nor
the manner in which the object should be
accomplished, if deemed expedient and
proper. Both these points were therefore
in terms, passed over in the reply of the
Secretary of State to the Texan minister,
as subjects the consideration of which had
not been entered upon by the executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional
power—is now presented by your inquiry;
not, however, in precisely the same
form. Then the application was for the
immediate admission of Texas into the
Union as an independent State; your ques-
tion looks only to its annexation as part
of the territory of the United States. There
is no express power given to any depart-
ment of the government to purchase terri-
tory except for the objects specified in the
constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the
power has, on several very important occa-
sions, been regarded as embraced in the
treaty-making power; and territories have
been so annexed with a view and under
engagements for their ultimate admission
into the Union as States. If there be no-
thing in the situation or condition of the
territory of Texas, which would render its
admission hereafter into the Union as a new
State improper, I cannot perceive any ob-
jection, on constitutional grounds, to its
annexation as a territory. In speaking of
the right to admit new States, I must, of
course, be understood as referring to the
Senate of Congress. The executive and
State may, as I have already observed,
by the exercise of the treaty-making power,
acquire territory; but new States can
be admitted by Congress; and the
authority over the subject, which is
given to it by the constitution, is contained
in the following provision, viz: "New States
may be admitted by the Congress into this
Union." The only restrictions imposed
upon this general power are, 1st: That no
new States shall be formed or erected
within the jurisdiction of any other State,
nor 2ndly, "Any State formed by the
junction of two or more States, or parts
of States, without the consent of the Leg-
islature concerned, as well as of Congress."

—restrictions which have no bearing upon
the present question. The matter, there-
fore, stands as it would do if the constitu-
tion said "new States may be admitted by
Congress into this Union," without addi-
tion or restriction. That these words,
taken by themselves, are broad enough to
authorize the admission of the Territory
of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted;
nor do I perceive upon what principle we
can set up limitations to a power so un-
qualified recognised by the constitution in
the plain simple words I have quoted, and
with which no other provision of that in-
strument conflicts in the slightest degree.
But if, with no other guides than our own
discretion, we assume limitations upon a
power so general, we are at least bound to
give to them some intelligible and definite
character. The most natural, and indeed
the only one of that nature has been
suggested, and which was presented by
Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts
might involve, to an equally great extent,
the well-being of the republic, and against
which abuse the constitution has provided
no other safeguards than the responsibil-
ities to their constituents and to the laws
of the land, of those whose sanction is ne-
cessary to the validity of an act of Con-
gress. Nor is it very unreasonable to sup-
pose that those who based their govern-
ment upon the great principle that it is
the right of the people to alter or abolish it,
and to institute new ones, in such forms as
they may think most likely to effect their
safety and happiness, should feel them-
selves secure in trusting to their representa-
tives in the House, in the Senate, and in
the executive chair, the right to admit new
members into the confederacy, with no o-
ther restrictions than those which they have
thought proper to specify.
It was under this view of the constitu-
tion that the purchase of Louisiana in 1803,
only fifteen years after the adoption of the
constitution, promising the incorporation
of the ceded territory into the Union, and
the admission, as soon as possible, of the
inhabitants to the enjoyment of all the
rights, advantages, and immunities of citi-
zens of the United States, was ratified, con-
firmed, and finally executed by every branch
of the federal government whose co-oper-
ation is required by the constitution. It is
true that Mr. Jefferson, in the interval be-
tween the negotiation and submission of the
treaty to the Senate, threw out the op-
inion that the constitution had made no
provision for our holding foreign territory,
nor for incorporating foreign States into
the Union. The fact of his approving the
treaty, and the laws necessary to its exe-
cution, must, however, be regarded as con-
clusive proof that, upon looking farther into
the matter, his opinion was changed. The
attempt to convince him of his error
was made by his friend, Governor Nicho-
las, as appears by Mr. Jefferson's letter to
him; and I have little doubt that, if his let-
ters to Breckenridge and Nicholas had
been published in his lifetime, or his at-
tention been in any other way directed
to their contents, he would, from his habit
of change, and explained the grounds on
which it was based. It is equally true that
the acceptance of the cession, as well as
the admission of the State, became party
questions, and were contested with partisan
warmth. Of the vital importance of that
great acquisition to the safety, prosperity,
and honor of the whole Union, there can,
however, now be no diversity of opinion.
But the councils of the nation in the course
of time, ceased to be at all divided upon
the question of constitutional power to ac-
cept a cession of foreign territory, with a
view to its ultimate admission into the
Union. In 1819 the Spanish treaty for the
cession of East and West Florida, con-
taining the usual stipulation for ultimate in-
corporation into the Union, was ratified,
upon the call of the names of the senators
present, it appeared that every one voted
for the ratification. Upon the question of
constitutional power, as far as that case
went, the Senate of the United States

might involve, to an equally great extent,
the well-being of the republic, and against
which abuse the constitution has provided
no other safeguards than the responsibil-
ities to their constituents and to the laws
of the land, of those whose sanction is ne-
cessary to the validity of an act of Con-
gress. Nor is it very unreasonable to sup-
pose that those who based their govern-
ment upon the great principle that it is
the right of the people to alter or abolish it,
and to institute new ones, in such forms as
they may think most likely to effect their
safety and happiness, should feel them-
selves secure in trusting to their representa-
tives in the House, in the Senate, and in
the executive chair, the right to admit new
members into the confederacy, with no o-
ther restrictions than those which they have
thought proper to specify.
It was under this view of the constitu-
tion that the purchase of Louisiana in 1803,
only fifteen years after the adoption of the
constitution, promising the incorporation
of the ceded territory into the Union, and
the admission, as soon as possible, of the
inhabitants to the enjoyment of all the
rights, advantages, and immunities of citi-
zens of the United States, was ratified, con-
firmed, and finally executed by every branch
of the federal government whose co-oper-
ation is required by the constitution. It is
true that Mr. Jefferson, in the interval be-
tween the negotiation and submission of the
treaty to the Senate, threw out the op-
inion that the constitution had made no
provision for our holding foreign territory,
nor for incorporating foreign States into
the Union. The fact of his approving the
treaty, and the laws necessary to its exe-
cution, must, however, be regarded as con-
clusive proof that, upon looking farther into
the matter, his opinion was changed. The
attempt to convince him of his error
was made by his friend, Governor Nicho-
las, as appears by Mr. Jefferson's letter to
him; and I have little doubt that, if his let-
ters to Breckenridge and Nicholas had
been published in his lifetime, or his at-
tention been in any other way directed
to their contents, he would, from his habit
of change, and explained the grounds on
which it was based. It is equally true that
the acceptance of the cession, as well as
the admission of the State, became party
questions, and were contested with partisan
warmth. Of the vital importance of that
great acquisition to the safety, prosperity,
and honor of the whole Union, there can,
however, now be no diversity of opinion.
But the councils of the nation in the course
of time, ceased to be at all divided upon
the question of constitutional power to ac-
cept a cession of foreign territory, with a
view to its ultimate admission into the
Union. In 1819 the Spanish treaty for the
cession of East and West Florida, con-
taining the usual stipulation for ultimate in-
corporation into the Union, was ratified,
upon the call of the names of the senators
present, it appeared that every one voted
for the ratification. Upon the question of
constitutional power, as far as that case
went, the Senate of the United States

did not find it necessary to consider the
question of constitutional power, nor
the manner in which the object should be
accomplished, if deemed expedient and
proper. Both these points were therefore
in terms, passed over in the reply of the
Secretary of State to the Texan minister,
as subjects the consideration of which had
not been entered upon by the executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional
power—is now presented by your inquiry;
not, however, in precisely the same
form. Then the application was for the
immediate admission of Texas into the
Union as an independent State; your ques-
tion looks only to its annexation as part
of the territory of the United States. There
is no express power given to any depart-
ment of the government to purchase terri-
tory except for the objects specified in the
constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the
power has, on several very important occa-
sions, been regarded as embraced in the
treaty-making power; and territories have
been so annexed with a view and under
engagements for their ultimate admission
into the Union as States. If there be no-
thing in the situation or condition of the
territory of Texas, which would render its
admission hereafter into the Union as a new
State improper, I cannot perceive any ob-
jection, on constitutional grounds, to its
annexation as a territory. In speaking of
the right to admit new States, I must, of
course, be understood as referring to the
Senate of Congress. The executive and
State may, as I have already observed,
by the exercise of the treaty-making power,
acquire territory; but new States can
be admitted by Congress; and the
authority over the subject, which is
given to it by the constitution, is contained
in the following provision, viz: "New States
may be admitted by the Congress into this
Union." The only restrictions imposed
upon this general power are, 1st: That no
new States shall be formed or erected
within the jurisdiction of any other State,
nor 2ndly, "Any State formed by the
junction of two or more States, or parts
of States, without the consent of the Leg-
islature concerned, as well as of Congress."

—restrictions which have no bearing upon
the present question. The matter, there-
fore, stands as it would do if the constitu-
tion said "new States may be admitted by
Congress into this Union," without addi-
tion or restriction. That these words,
taken by themselves, are broad enough to
authorize the admission of the Territory
of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted;
nor do I perceive upon what principle we
can set up limitations to a power so un-
qualified recognised by the constitution in
the plain simple words I have quoted, and
with which no other provision of that in-
strument conflicts in the slightest degree.
But if, with no other guides than our own
discretion, we assume limitations upon a
power so general, we are at least bound to
give to them some intelligible and definite
character. The most natural, and indeed
the only one of that nature has been
suggested, and which was presented by
Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts

did not find it necessary to consider the
question of constitutional power, nor
the manner in which the object should be
accomplished, if deemed expedient and
proper. Both these points were therefore
in terms, passed over in the reply of the
Secretary of State to the Texan minister,
as subjects the consideration of which had
not been entered upon by the executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional
power—is now presented by your inquiry;
not, however, in precisely the same
form. Then the application was for the
immediate admission of Texas into the
Union as an independent State; your ques-
tion looks only to its annexation as part
of the territory of the United States. There
is no express power given to any depart-
ment of the government to purchase terri-
tory except for the objects specified in the
constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the
power has, on several very important occa-
sions, been regarded as embraced in the
treaty-making power; and territories have
been so annexed with a view and under
engagements for their ultimate admission
into the Union as States. If there be no-
thing in the situation or condition of the
territory of Texas, which would render its
admission hereafter into the Union as a new
State improper, I cannot perceive any ob-
jection, on constitutional grounds, to its
annexation as a territory. In speaking of
the right to admit new States, I must, of
course, be understood as referring to the
Senate of Congress. The executive and
State may, as I have already observed,
by the exercise of the treaty-making power,
acquire territory; but new States can
be admitted by Congress; and the
authority over the subject, which is
given to it by the constitution, is contained
in the following provision, viz: "New States
may be admitted by the Congress into this
Union." The only restrictions imposed
upon this general power are, 1st: That no
new States shall be formed or erected
within the jurisdiction of any other State,
nor 2ndly, "Any State formed by the
junction of two or more States, or parts
of States, without the consent of the Leg-
islature concerned, as well as of Congress."

—restrictions which have no bearing upon
the present question. The matter, there-
fore, stands as it would do if the constitu-
tion said "new States may be admitted by
Congress into this Union," without addi-
tion or restriction. That these words,
taken by themselves, are broad enough to
authorize the admission of the Territory
of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted;
nor do I perceive upon what principle we
can set up limitations to a power so un-
qualified recognised by the constitution in
the plain simple words I have quoted, and
with which no other provision of that in-
strument conflicts in the slightest degree.
But if, with no other guides than our own
discretion, we assume limitations upon a
power so general, we are at least bound to
give to them some intelligible and definite
character. The most natural, and indeed
the only one of that nature has been
suggested, and which was presented by
Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts
I have already referred to an application
for the accomplishment of the same object
that was made to this government by Tex-
as, whilst I was President. The history
of the Texan revolution, and the then con-
dition of that republic, as well as the prob-
able advantages to result to both from the
proposed annexation, were placed before us
in an elaborate and able communication.
It can scarcely be necessary to say that the
application was considered with that atten-
tion and care which were due to so grave
a proposition, and under the full influence
of feelings of sincere solicitude for the pros-
perity and permanent welfare of a young
and neighboring State, whose independence
we had been the first to acknowledge—
feelings which constitute, and I sincerely
hope, ever will constitute, the prevailing sen-
timent of the people of the United States.
In coming to the decision which it became
my duty to make, I was aided, in addition
to the other members of my cabinet, by
the counsel & constitutional advice of two
distinguished citizens of your own section
of the Union, of the first order of intellect,
great experience in public affairs, and whose
devotion to their own, as well as every o-
ther section of the Union, was above all
question. The result of our united opin-
ions was announced to the Texan minis-
ter, (Gen. Hunt,) in a communication from
the late Mr. Forsyth, the substance of which
I cannot better express than by incorpo-
rating one or two brief extracts from it in
this letter. Upon the general subject, my
own views