

be woefully wanting in our duty if we did not seek to know the truth as to our political condition on this question.

Do not fear, gentlemen, that I shall abuse your patience, which I have already, perhaps, taxed too much, but the details so clear, so authoritative, that have been given you by my illustrious colleague [M. Berryer] on the financial question, seem to me to have been left unanswered. [Cries of no, no.]

A VOICE. Read the *Moniteur*!

M. JULES FAVRE. It is certain, to my eyes at least, that the Emperor Maximilian, in taking possession of his new empire, assumes charges under the weight of which he will have great difficulty in establishing his government.

But here, gentlemen, I meet with an objection that has several times been urged in this debate, and to which I cannot fail to reply. Whenever a member rises here within these precincts in order to call your attention to this question, you know that he is treated as a disloyal citizen.

A VOICE. Yes, and very justly.

M. JULES FAVRE. And you have heard it asserted, in one of your recent sessions, that in the English Parliament such discussions would not be possible. [That is true, that is true!]

M. GLAIS BIZOIN. No; for no English Parliament would have ever tolerated such an expedition. [Murmurs of disapprobation.]

M. JULES FAVRE. There may be a reason for this, gentlemen; it is because the English nation is not under guardianship; [cries of disapprobation;] it is because in demanding peace it is not likely to expose itself to war; it is because it can manage its affairs, and it is for this reason, gentlemen, that it sometimes abstains from criticising them.

As to us, we are for the most part of the time called to control events that have been accomplished. And then it would be a very singular and very humiliating condition in which we would be placed, were we always to approve under pain of being wanting in patriotism. [Murmurs of disapprobation.]

And permit me, since the minister has touched upon English history, to remind you that his recollections in this respect have rather failed him; and when I revert to the end of the last century and to the commencement of the present, oh! then, gentlemen, I perceive a tremendous struggle in progress. France stands at the head of the new ideas. She is herself engaged in terrible convulsions that might terrify Europe. Yet not the less for all that does she pronounce words of emancipation and of liberty; and then the coalition of all the old despots is formed against her, and by their side is England found, England directed by a great man, by an eminent minister, but one who, in my opinion, was blinded by the contracted views of national hatred. He struggled against us and thus dragged his country into incalculable evils.

Yes, I acknowledge, he had an inflamed public opinion on his side, and in a parliament like this, one day when those irritating questions were in debate, a man arose in opposition to the common opinion, in spite of the murmurs that would have drowned his voice, and although he was forced to renounce illustrious friendships, he maintained the cause of liberty and of France. That man was Fox, and it is impossible to say what might have been the result if his wise counsels had been followed. But that which all sensible men can affirm is, that if England, instead of combating the French revolution, had sought to moderate and direct it, there would have been fifty years less of struggles, fatal struggles, battles, woe and blood, perhaps somewhat less of glory, but certainly more civilization and liberty. [Applause around the speaker.]

You see, then, that it sometimes happens that English statesmen have courageously resisted the impulse of popular opinion, believing thereby that they performed their duty, and in fact thus performing it. As to us, what have we said? I do not wish to repeat it here.

The minister has had reason to tell you that these great events had entered upon a new phase; only, perhaps, he has forgotten those different phases. The minister has traced for you a brilliant picture of the splendor reserved for America, thanks to our devotedness, to our courage, to our civilizing spirit. It is to accomplish this gigantic work that we have landed on the shores of Mexico!

Gentlemen, let the minister permit me to remind him that all this is but a poetic after-stroke; it is a grand programme that has been traced out by the victorious hand of France, but which the hand of her policy had not prepared. [Divers interruptions.]

If I refer back to the origin itself of the enterprise, I find that all this grandeur is in singular contrast with the 2,500 men that formed the first contingent of France, and with the pacific declarations which she circulated among all the cabinets of Europe!

I acknowledge it, time and events have progressed and have imposed imperious obligations upon us. Yet once more, I say I will not retrace the past, I will take things as they exist. Only, the minister will permit me to say to him: if Prince Maximilian is traversing the ocean, and if, to use his magnificent language, the waves seem to be obedient to him, if the shores shake with joy at his approach, if he is soon to be received with unanimous acclamations, [murmurs,] ah! let them burst forth, but it is his cruellest enemies who prepare these ovations for him. [Cries of no! no!] And, as for me, I highly admire, indeed, a people that would place their patriotism, after their defeat, in wreathing crowns of glory for a foreign prince that is sent to them by a victorious enemy. [Murmurs of disapprobation.]

In fine, let us look into the reality to find out the true aspect of the question. If the Emperor Maximilian could realize all the wonders which you have heard in the eloquent speech of the minister of state, we also, gentlemen, in spite of the greatness of the sacrifices that have been imposed upon France, we also would applaud him; but the difference between the minister and ourselves consists in the confidence entertained as to the success of such an enterprise.

NUMEROUS VOICES. Wait a while.

M. JULES FAVRE. But this is not what we have now to discuss. That the Emperor Maximilian, intrusted with these new destinies, may conduct his empire to the highest summit of glory, is my sincere desire. I place no obstacle in his way; but I ask if all this is not romance, and if the reality is not otherwise; if, in reality, this great prince is no more than a lieutenant of France? [Interruption.]

This is the only true question, and it is in this way that it affects our interests, our honor, and our policy.

When the session was opened, what was the language held forth by the government? I take it from an official document, of which I ask your permission to quote some lines. The feeling was unanimous, I shall not say to blame, but at least to regret, distant enterprises. [Interruptions.]

If these enterprises were necessary, they were accepted, but the necessity was deplored which required them, and an evident desire was manifested that they should be brought to a speedy conclusion. This conclusion was very precisely indicated for the government; for here, gentlemen, is what I read in the report made by the honorable M. Larrabure:

"At this time, the Emperor's government declares that it has entered into no engagement with any one, either to leave a force of French troops in Mexico, or to guarantee any loan whatever. It declares that there is no reason whatever to suppose that it is necessary to increase the French forces now actually serving in Mexico; and that any movements that may take place up to the time of their withdrawal will have for their only object to replace the sick or those whose term of service may have expired. According to present estimates, the government hopes that the end of the year 1864 will mark the conclusion of the expedition."

There are things to be remarked in this paragraph: a hope that the expedition may end with the year 1864; a double engagement—the one that no troops will be left in Mexico and that no obligation has been incurred in this respect; the second, that no support will be given to any loan.

SEVERAL VOICES. That no guarantee will be given.

M. JULES FAVRE. Now, you know what has become of this double engagement; you know how we have been repaid for the expenses of the war. It is a new proceeding, and one which I recommend to the statesmen of our day, to make the victorious power pay the expenses of the war; for it is France that issues 66 millions of bonds, which become in her hands accommodation notes furnished with her signature. [Murmur.]

As to the engagement not to leave any troops in Mexico, how will it be compatible with the declarations which I read in the official journals?

We have sent the Emperor Maximilian across the seas we have pointed out Mexico to him as a point towards which he should proceed, because he would be received there with unanimous acclamation; such is the pompous language of eloquence. But now here is the reality of the case.

In the treaty, which is published in the *Moniteur* of the 17th of April, I see that "the government of his Majesty the Emperor of the French and that of his Majesty the Emperor of Mexico, animated by an equal desire to secure the restoration of order in Mexico and to consolidate the new empire, have resolved to regulate by mutual agreement the conditions of the sojourn of the French troops in that country."

So we are very far from the declarations of the honorable Mr. Larrabure, as contained for in his report.

Hope has vanished; as to engagements, it has been deemed possible to set them totally aside. Our troops will remain in Mexico, how long? They will remain there until the Emperor Maximilian is firmly established, for that is the work undertaken by France; and when she is told that the Mexican expedition is finished she is deceived; she should know this; the Mexican expedition is scarcely commenced. [Cries of disapprobation.] It is necessary to establish the new empire firmly, in the midst of difficulties of all kinds, of parties and factions. Such is the work prepared for France.

And for this, gentlemen, what are the sacrifices demanded of her? They ask her to leave at the disposal of the Emperor Maximilian a *corps d'armée* of 25,000 men, and there is no determinate period for its recall; circumstances must decide as to the time of its withdrawal, and you know how much elasticity there is in such propositions as that. It is therefore for an indeterminate time that we keep 25,000 men in Mexico.

They tell us, gentlemen, that they will be paid by the Mexican government. Permit me to say that I consider it a deplorable condition for France to have herself paid thus. [Murmurs and marks of disapprobation.]

No, France should not sell the blood of her children in order to establish a foreign empire. [Renewed murmurs.]

I find in this enterprise undertaken to Mexico detestable ideas, dynastic ideas, which I oppose with all my strength, for they are contrary to the new spirit on which the policy of France reposes. [Various manifestations of disorder.]

There is, therefore, a force of 25,000 men of which you are deprived for an indeterminate period; a force of 25,000 men is placed in the pay of a foreign prince; it will be commanded by a French officer, but it will not be the less, for all that, subject to the inspirations of a foreign policy. Now this foreign policy will gradually diverge from you in proportion as this new empire of Mexico will develop itself; it will become national, and less like to yours, and then it may involve you in enterprises, in adventures, and in dangers that we cannot now calculate. [Renewed interruption.]

Is that which I say, gentlemen, a simple supposition? The minister has spoken to us of a fact, in regard to which it is impossible to maintain silence; I refer to the declaration of the Congress of the United States. [Sensation.]

M. ERNEST PICARD. That is a very serious matter!

M. JULES FAVRE. That this act has no diplomatic value, I am aware; it is not the less for that the manifestation of an opinion of which we must take notice. But what the minister knows as well as I do is, that this manifestation is not an isolated fact; that it has assumed an official character; that the United States have entered into regular and categorical explanations; and I request your permission to lay before you some lines of a despatch.

SOME MEMBERS. No, no.

OTHER MEMBERS. Yes, yes. Go on; speak.

M. JULES FAVRE. Here is the despatch from the minister of foreign affairs of the United States to Mr. Dayton, their minister resident at Paris, and which has been communicated to the French minister of foreign affairs. It is of the date of the 26th of September, 1863, and here is what I read in it. After some expressions of politeness and regard for France, the American minister subjoins:

"This reserve does not prevent the government from acknowledging and declaring that the real opinion in Mexico is in favor of a domestic and republican government—" (Ah! ah!)

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Now we have it!

M. JULES FAVRE.—"in preference to any monarchical institution whatever that might be imposed upon it from without."

The expression used here may seem to you to be in bad taste; but, as to the thing, it is excellent, and for my part I believe that princes are so much the more firmly established as they are the more national, and I would never advise any state to go out of its own limits to choose one.

"Our government," adds the minister of the United States, "also acknowledges that this real opinion of the Mexican people is due in a great measure to the influence of the popular opinion in our own country, and that it continually receives a new impulse therefrom."

"The United States do not conceal that, in their opinion, their own safety, no less than the manifest and brilliant destiny to which they aspire, are intimately connected with the maintenance of free republican institutions throughout the whole of America. They have submitted this opinion to the Emperor of the French, at a proper time, and as one worthy of his serious attention, in order that he may determine in what manner he should conduct and terminate happily the war in Mexico."

"It is not any further necessary to maintain a strict reserve on that other point; if France, after mature consideration, believed it her duty to adopt in regard to Mexico a policy in opposition to the sentiments and the opinions of which I have spoken, this policy may sow the seed of jealousies which, in their development, may bring on a conflict between France, the United States, and the other American republics." (Oh! oh!)

That, gentlemen, is a diplomatic document; and unless you go so far as to say that these declarations are of no importance, and that sovereign wisdom consists in the greatest ignorance and in supreme delusion, we must take these facts into careful consideration.

Here is another despatch, under date of October 23, 1863, containing the following paragraphs:

"In consideration of these facts, M. Drouyn de Lhuys intimates that a prompt acknowledgment by the United States of the projected empire would be agreeable to France, and would free her, sooner than could otherwise be hoped for under present circumstances, from her embarrassing complications with Mexico."

"Fortunately, we have never concealed the fact from the French government that, in the opinion of the United States, the establishment of a foreign and monarchical government would be neither easy nor desirable. You will inform M. Drouyn de Lhuys that our opinion in this respect has not changed."

And further on it says: "It is, however, useful that you should inform M. Drouyn de Lhuys that the United States regard Mexico as the theatre of a war which has not yet resulted in the overthrow of the government which has for a considerable time existed in that country, and with which the United States continue to maintain relations of peace and sincere friendship. Consequently the United States are not free to take into consideration the question of the acknowledgment of a government which, in consequence of the future eventualities of this war, might be called to replace the present government."

You see, gentlemen, unless you close your eyes to the light, that we must recognize that the seeds of distrust and hostility have been sown between two countries, the union of which is so necessary to the grandeur and prosperity of both. These seeds are so much the more to be feared as the condition of the United States is the more threatened, as they are passing at the present moment through a terrible and bloody crisis, which, whatever may be the issue of it, will leave on the deserted theatres of strife numerous bands of adventurers who, sooner or later, will proceed to find work for their swords in a country to which their passion will impel them. [Various exclamations.]

Now, in view of these events, has France been sufficiently prudent? I do not wish to examine the course that she might have pursued, and should, perhaps, have pursued, in reference to the great fact of the secession. It is incontestible that, if her voice had made itself heard, if she had been able to manifest those secret sympathies which, I doubt not, exist in her heart for the triumph of human liberty and the final suppression of slavery, it would have been a very useful aid to the United States.

I add that our naval power and our commerce would have profited thereby; for, in examining the state of our relations with the New World, here is what we find and what is known to every one. The New World is our principal furnisher of that indispensable staple, for which we are at this moment making sacrifices that are becoming more and more troublesome to our monetary affairs.

In fact, in the last session, mention was made of the Bank of France. [Renewed exclamations.]

On this point, gentlemen, I wish to say nothing but this—it is well understood that it is not a subject which I desire to draw into discussion—you know that in the years preceding 1859, Europe bought about five million bales—more exactly 4,872,000 bales—of cotton, of which three-quarters were furnished by America. At present, gentlemen, Europe is under the necessity not only of restricting its consumption considerably, but of looking for almost the whole of that raw staple in countries which do not return her remittances in specie; and whilst America operated with her by means of exchange, India and Egypt retain her silver and gold, the former to make idols, and the latter to bury it in her vaults.

It is thus, gentlemen, that the deposits in the Bank of France go on continually diminishing.

It has been announced to you that at the present time the deposits have increased to 240 millions. But if you choose to look at preceding years, you will see that in 1859 the minimum amount was 508 millions and the maximum 644 millions; that, in 1860, the deposits varied from 514 to 551 millions; a fact which should claim the serious attention of all financiers, and which should not be neglected by politicians, who are well aware that the great resolutions taken by prudent nations have a direct influence on their commercial relations, and that it behooves, if it be possible, to put an end, and that at the earliest moment, to the war now waged in America between the northern and the southern States.

Now, a circumstance has occurred to which, in conclusion, I desire permission to call your attention, and to provoke a reply from the government.

I said that I did not wish to examine its conduct in the general management of this affair; but I remember that, in the month of June, 1861, an official declaration was made, in presence of the world, by which France bound herself to preserve the strictest neutrality between the two belligerents.

You know, however, that in the commencement of the year 1862 France endeavored to influence the cabinet of Washington so far as to make it accept an armistice. But what is more significant is, that quite recently public opinion has been very justly moved at the revelation of facts in regard to which a categorical explanation is indispensable.

In the months of April and July, 1863, two houses received orders for the construction of six iron-clad vessels. Two of these vessels were of the class called *rams* with block-houses. And yet these houses asserted that these vessels thus constructed were simple trading vessels.

I do not examine here the question as to what the intention was. It is a point not in discussion here, and which I entirely set aside. Only these orders were given by persons whose names are well known throughout Europe, by Captain Bullock, of the Confederate States, and Mr. Slidell, who has obtained a celebrity which is yet within all recollections; and when these builders were told that these six vessels were destined to navigate between Shanghai and San Francisco, and thus to connect California and China by means of vessels armed with block-houses, I think that very serious doubts might naturally have arisen in the minds of these honorable constructors.

But I have a right to find these doubts, especially in the minds of the watchful members of the government; and when, under date of June 1, application was made to the minister of marine in order to obtain authority to put rifled cannon on board of these innocent trading vessels, then it might have been perceived that there was something serious in the matter, and the names of Bullock and Slidell were significant enough to authorize such a conclusion to be drawn.

It was drawn, for the requisite authority was granted. [Sensation and various demonstrations.]

It is true that, as some rumor of the affair had reached the other side of the Atlantic, the

minister of foreign affairs of the United States wrote to Mr. Dayton: that Mr. Dayton had an interview with the minister of foreign affairs of France; that the latter made some representations on the subject to his colleague of the marine; and that, in the month of October, the authority previously granted was withdrawn.

But, gentlemen, certain journals still no less persist in asserting that these vessels are armed, that two have been launched in the port of Brest, and it is positively said will be allowed to sail.

I request the government not to leave such a question as this undecided. There is involved in it, I shall not say our honor or our safety—for here I care not to use such words—but there is involved in it our political probity.

The declaration of the month of June, 1861, is too explicit not to bind the government in the most formal manner.

Under such circumstances, gentlemen, its language should dispel every kind of doubt. There is no question here of a fact susceptible of various interpretations. You see within what limits it is restricted; and I hope that the government will not permit the slightest shadow of uncertainty to remain here. Such a course is absolutely indispensable; for if it could be imagined that, departing from the course which she has formally traced out for herself, France could take part for one or other of the belligerents, I leave it to your own minds to conceive what the deplorable result might be of such a state of things.

Assuredly, gentlemen, I can say with the greatest sincerity that we have no interest in augmenting our political embarrassments. I have endeavored to show you how, in my opinion, these embarrassments have been the consequence of the faults committed by diplomacy. It is because our policy has been equivocal, because its language has not been strong and precise, because it has undertaken everything without accomplishing anything, that at the same time it has compromised everything. [Cries of no, no.]

VOICES AROUND THE SPEAKER. That is true.
M. JULES FAVRE. It must renounce this system of feebleness; and do you know the remedy for this? It must have confidence in the nation, in its virility, in its expansion. Those who guide the nation must cease to be its pedagogues and its masters in order to become its inspired chiefs, counselled and directed by it, [various manifestations:] and like the divinity of the fable, instead of remaining in the clouds, they must take their stand-point on the earth which gives them strength—that is, on the soil of liberty. [Various interruptions.]

On this condition, I do not say—neither do I wish it—that they will be able to command the world and to impose laws upon it; but at least they will no longer expose themselves to see their words belied and their signatures protested. [Murmurs of disapprobation from various benches. Applause from the benches around the speaker.]

Speech of M. Rouher, Minister of State, in reply to M. Jules Favre.

[Extract.]

If I examine the speech of the honorable M. Jules Favre, taking his objections in an inverse order from that which he has adopted, the first point to which I come is this pretended violation of the rules of neutrality committed by France towards the northern States of America.

Gentlemen, questions of neutrality and the extent of the rights of neutrals have at all times been a source of difficulty and of numerous conflicts. I do not wish here to review the numerous phases through which the rights of neutrals have passed in the code of international law. But what I can say to the honor of the policy of our country is, that everything in the nature of liberal, progressive, generous ideas, introduced into the legislation of neutrals, has originated with the French government. [“That is true; that is true.”]

So, at the declaration of war in America between the States of the north and the States of the south, we were not wanting to these precedents, and from the very first day we laid down the principles of neutrality that were to govern our whole conduct.

In the declaration of the 1st of June, 1861, published in the *Moniteur*, an official act emanating from the sovereign, it is laid down in article 3 that—

“It is forbidden to every Frenchman to take a commission from either of the two parties for the purpose of fitting out vessels-of-war, or to receive letters of marque in order to prey upon commerce, or to be concerned in any manner whatever in the equipment or armament of a vessel-of-war or privateer for either of the two belligerent parties.”

In the month of June, 1863, a request was made by two French constructors for permission to build two steamers, it being indicated that these vessels were destined to navigate in the seas of China.

The Minister of the United States, in the month of December, 1863, referred to letters and documents which circumstances, the character of which we have not wished to sift, had placed in the possession of Mr. Dayton. He maintained that these vessels were intended for the confederates. An investigation was immediately commenced. The constructors were questioned, their explanations were weighed, and the authorization, temporarily given, was withdrawn by the government.

Some time afterwards doubts arose; those steamers, which are not ready to depart, were indicated as destined for Sweden. New investigations were made. This destination did not seem sufficiently demonstrated, and under date of May 1, 1864, ten days ago, the minister of marine wrote to the minister of foreign affairs: “The vessels of war to which you refer will not be permitted to sail from the French ports until it is shown in the most positive manner that their destination does not affect the principles of neutrality which the French government desires vigorously to observe in regard to the belligerents.”

Such is the unequivocal course that has been pursued by the Emperor's government in the clearest and most precise manner.

And now let me be permitted to invoke the talents and eloquence of the honorable M. Jules Favre, in order to impress the United States with principles equally precise and equally clear in regard to this affair of neutrality.

At the very time that he reproaches us with not having sufficiently observed the rules laid down by the declaration of June 11, 1861, the French government is struggling with the government of the United States in order to have coal declared not contraband of war, and perhaps delivered to such of our vessels as proceed to Mexico. I hope that the considerations so very brilliant, presented by M. Jules Favre in favor of the government of the United States, will influence that government to take the representations to which I allude into most serious consideration. [Approbative laughter.] We must then reject this vain accusation. It has absolutely no foundation whatever. The French government has not deviated in the slightest degree from the most loyal neutrality. [“Very good; very good.”]

Here I come to the considerations presented by the honorable M. Jules Favre in reference to the secession, in reference to the impossibility of obtaining for European industry those supplies of cotton heretofore furnished by America, and to the consequences which those difficulties have produced in regard to the deposits of the Bank of France.

Indeed, gentlemen, it requires great courage to impute to the French government any responsibility for such a condition of things—[“Good, good”]—and I ask myself why we are reproached for this lamentable, fratricidal war that is now waged in the United States, and in which we have sought to intervene, not as arbiters, but as conciliators. [Renewed approbation.]

Now, I find it my duty once more to take up the Mexican question. I am compelled to weigh the arguments that have been presented.

Is it true that the treaty which has been made is a violation of previous engagements, of declarations and promises made by the government in your presence? Is it true that the threat of American intervention is ever suspended, like the sword of Damocles, over the future of Mexico?

Gentlemen, whilst the honorable M. Jules Favre spoke, whilst I listened to those ironical laudations by him of the pretended eloquence of the organ of the government, when describing with complacency the future of Mexico, its expected splendor, the pacification of that country, the manifestations of order and regularity that were to be developed there, I read patiently, without any excitement at this irony, the advices from Mexico that just reached me at the moment—[sensation]—and therein I found the following words:

“The general condition of affairs in Mexico is improving every day, in proportion as the masses understand and appreciate better the generous views of the Emperor in their regard. The resistance, localized at some points, has now lost all national color; the guerilla bands fly on the approach of our troops, and whenever they are surprised they are cut to pieces. It is becoming more and more a question of brigandage, from which the inoffensive population cruelly suffers, but to which an end will very readily be put by a well organized system of police.”

“For a month or two past, especially, it is seen that confidence is reviving. The capital sees thronging from every quarter citizens of all classes and of all opinions, who intermingle with each other and forget their enmities, and seek to unite upon one sentiment, forgetfulness of the past, faith in the future. In this condition of things, with the support of the Emperor's government and the aid of European capitalists, Mexico cannot fail to enter promptly on a career of material prosperity, by which Europe will be the first to profit.”

M. ERNEST PICARD. The signature!

THE MINISTER OF STATE. Such is the news which M. de Montholon, our minister to Mexico, sends to the minister of foreign affairs by the mail that has just arrived.

That is not all. I have preserved to some extent the custom of occupying myself with those commercial questions amid which I lived for eight years, and I have been desirous to know the commercial movement in the port of Vera Cruz. An account of it has been

transmitted to me by this same mail, though it was not supposed that I would have to make use of it so advantageously and so very soon. [Approbative laughter.]

It appears from it that the orders brought by the mail of the Florida, which arrived yesterday in the port of Saint Nazaire, amount for tissues alone to no less than one million of piastres. Such is the condition of that country, such is the progress of its development, such is the merchandise for which it sends to Europe; such is the way in which it contradicts the statement of the lamentable condition indicated by the honorable M. Jules Favre, who experiences, in spite of himself, a sort of regret at seeing himself deprived of that patronage of Juarez, whom he had so well defended. ["Good, good." Applause.]

M. JULES FAVRE. Your client is fortune.

The MINISTER OF STATE. I did not understand M. Jules Favre.

M. JULES FAVRE. I said that your client was fortune. [Cries of disapprobation.]

The MINISTER OF STATE. Yes, gentlemen, fortune is the client of France. ["That is true."] Providence protects her and reason guides her. ["Good, good."] For that reason it is that fortune is faithful to us. [Enthusiastic approbation.]

I now come to the two fundamental objections that have been made: the treaty and America.

First, the treaty. We have, it is said, made an indefinite engagement to keep our troops in Mexico; we have guaranteed the loan proposed by the Emperor of Mexico, and thus we have violated the declarations made before the committee, the report of which was presented by the honorable M. Larrabure. Let us examine.

In truth, I ask myself first by what singular distortion of language any one can have come to the supposition that the loan has been guaranteed by France, because France has accepted sixty-six millions of negotiable bonds of the loan, and is called upon to negotiate them, not with her signature, but with that of the Emperor of Mexico, the only guarantor of the payment of the interest. How can any one come to comprehend that there is any violation of plighted faith, when, with the utmost scrupulousness and the greatest sincerity, we have maintained, observed up to the very latest moment all the declarations solemnly made before the legislative body. The loan has been contracted for by the Emperor of Mexico; it has been voluntarily subscribed for by those who judged that Mexico presented sufficient guarantees. And, indeed, your course is not very well calculated to assure the capitalists of our country who have thought proper to engage in this enterprise. [Manifestations of approbation.]

Hurried on by an impulse of fiery opposition, at a time when every consideration would have dictated respect and patience, the honorable M. Jules Favre begins by attacking everything. He declares that there is an utter impossibility of raising resources in Mexico. He declares to the voluntary holders of the Mexican bonds that there is an impossibility for them of ever realizing their value. Now, gentlemen, that is not patriotic. ["Bravo, bravo."] And when the honorable M. Jules Favre, searching in the records of the past, invoked the memory of one of England's great men, he confounded at the same time the object and the circumstances of the conflict to which he makes allusion. That great man arose in the House of Commons in order to proclaim there the great principles of humanity, of civilization, and of peace, and not to propose, under the slightest pretexts, declarations of war against all Europe. Yes, Fox at that moment performed a great duty towards civilization; he wished to arrest two nations ready to come to blows; he arose to oppose Pitt; he desired to calm the ardor of the military spirit; he did not succeed, but it is to his eternal honor that he made the attempt. On the contrary, the honorable M. Jules Favre has depreciated the credit of a new empire and paralyzed a work of civilization. Ah! if you played the part of Fox here, if your part were the same as his, believe me, I would be, with all my heart, on your side. ["Good, good."]

The treaty, it is said, might contain engagements at variance with the declarations which we have made. What does it contain? In the last months of this year the *corps d'armée* will be reduced to 25,000 men. The expedition is terminated, and, in fact, the letter which I have just read proves it. A general pacification is effected everywhere, and the return of ten thousand of our soldiers will be effected before the 1st of January, 1865.

As to the 25,000 men, whose stay has been indicated in the treaty, what is the stipulation in their regard? We declare that we will remain temporarily in Mexico, in order to protect our interests, the interests which occasioned the intervention.

M. GUEROULT. Will the minister have the goodness to read the article of the treaty? [Noise and confusion.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Do not interrupt.

The MINISTER OF STATE. I have not the treaty with me. If the honorable M. Guerot will please pass it to me I will read it to the Chamber.

M. GUEROULT. I am not positive, but, as far as I can remember, I think that the treaty provides that the 25,000 men shall remain in Mexico until the Emperor Maximilian is able to do without us.

The MINISTER OF STATE. The honorable M. Guerot is mistaken; his memory serves him badly; and from my recollections I will give him the substance, if not the precise text of the treaty and its provisions.

By article 1 it is indicated that the *corps d'armée* shall be reduced as soon as possible to 25,000 men.

By a second provision we declare that our *corps d'armée* is to remain temporarily in Mexico, in order to protect our interests.

M. ERNEST PICARD. The interests that occasioned the intervention. [Marks of disapprobation. "Do not interrupt, do not interrupt."] I merely come to the assistance of the minister.

The MINISTER OF STATE. I resume—

M. ERNEST PICARD. Give us the text.

The MINISTER OF STATE. I am going to give the honorable M. Picard the text, which has just been handed to me, and he will then permit me to comment upon it, and to demonstrate in the clearest manner the truth of my assertions.

"Article 1. The French troops that are now in Mexico will be reduced as soon as possible to a corps of 25,000 men, including therein the foreign legion.

"This corps, in order to protect our interests which occasioned the intervention, will remain temporarily in Mexico under the conditions laid down in the following articles."

So 25,000 men are to remain temporarily, the time is not fixed; no obligatory delay is determined upon; the appreciation of this delay belongs to France; she is the judge of the motives that must cause the continuance of her troops there to protect the interests that occasioned this intervention. [Noisy demonstrations.]

But this occupation cannot be indefinitely prolonged at the will of France; the Emperor of Mexico, who, to the great regret of the honorable M. Jules Favre, pays twenty-five millions a year for the stay of our troops, should have the right of requesting their evacuation. The Emperor of Mexico has, therefore, reserved to himself the right of asking the evacuation of our troops, according as the organization of the Mexican army may progress.

Article 2, in fact, adds: "The French troops will evacuate Mexico according as his Majesty the Emperor of Mexico may be able to organize the troops necessary to take their place

M. GUEROULT. But when will they be organized? In the mean time we will remain in Mexico.

The MINISTER OF STATE. I am going to answer the honorable M. Guerot's difficulty. What says he? we will be obliged to remain there until the Mexican army is organized. That is the objection.

Well, I ask the honorable gentleman whether he knows the facts? Has he studied them? Does he not know that the Mexican army is organized, that it has a force of 25,000 men? Does he not see that there is a community of interest between the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Mexico to put an end to a burdensome occupation?

Are there men, therefore, so much governed by their petty passions as that they do not wish to comprehend the elevated character of this agreement? Yes, undoubtedly, we may be called upon to remain in Mexico until the Mexican army is organized; but that army now exists, it is organized. Did not the honorable M. Berryer declare the day before yesterday that within the space of eighteen months that army would cost the Mexican government an expenditure of thirty-seven millions? Did he not deduct this sum from the resources of Mexico? The Mexican army, therefore, exists. So this provision laid down in article 3 is being realized every day. It is realized; the departure of the French troops has been resolved upon in advance; and the day when it shall take place we will all equally hail with satisfaction, both in France and in Mexico. ["Good, good."]

If some persons regard with chagrin the fact that the duration of the French troops in Mexico is undetermined, it is a matter of slight concern to me, because such men are revolutionists, who would like to have renewed in that unhappy country the agitations heretofore directed by Juarez. The word *temporarily* inserted in the treaty is a prudential provision to prevent the renewal of anarchical passions, for the outbreak of which the day appointed for the evacuation would be the signal.

The treaty is, therefore, above criticism, it is sincere; its entire spirit is in conformity with the purposes announced by the government in the discussion of the address. ["That is true, that is true."]

As to America, we must examine that question at some length.

It is not good thus to put between two great nations like America and France a pretended germ of discord, a pretended threat formally enunciated against our country or against Mexico, when there is at bottom nothing but a moment of transitory excitement, with which the Congress of the United States—a transitory excitement somewhat analogous to that which we have seen produced at the time of the seizure of Messrs. Mason and Slidell on the Trent, and which did not prevent the government from effecting the restitution of those two prisoners in conformity with the law of nations.

What, then, could be the afterthought of America? Would she wish to seize upon Mexico, and incorporate it with her States? Has she wished that she could have done so before. The American army was at the city of Mexico in 1847 and 1848. She had conquered the government then existing, I believe it was that of Santa Anna; she could have remained mistress of the territory; she did not even try to do so. She liquidated her con-

dition, she determined her indemnities; she obtained, if I am not mistaken, a better settlement of the limits of Texas, the cession of New California and New Mexico, and, in virtue of these territorial arrangements, she withdrew peaceably, without pretence of any annexation.

Yet the occasion was highly favorable. America was victorious; she was mistress not only of the capital, but of the entire country. Her army had been divided into two corps: one, starting from Matamoras, had seized the provinces as far as the city of Mexico; the other set out from Vera Cruz, and gained possession of Puebla before reaching the capital.

Is it solely to overturn a throne that America would design a declaration of war against Mexico? But at the present moment that great country is rent by civil war. Who can foresee the moment when that struggle shall terminate? Who can foresee the moment when cohesion shall be restored between the two parties so violently separated one from the other?

A MEMBER. Perhaps it will never be restored.
The **MINISTER OF STATE.** During the time that must elapse before the restoration of peace in the United States, can we not entertain a legitimate hope of seeing the new Mexican empire firmly established? When those great commotions shall have been finally settled in America, commercial interests will resume their empire; they will paralyze all desires for war between Mexico and the United States, and will produce a happy state of international relations between the two countries? [Marks of approbation.]

Assuredly, gentlemen, these temporary causes of impotence on the part of the United States I refer to only with regret. What I desire for the honor of civilization, what I desire by reason of the sympathies which animate me towards that nation by whose cradle France stood as sponsor—"Good, good"—is that this war, which has so long desolated the American continent, should come to as speedy a solution as possible. But on the day when this war will have ceased, then I shall be more assured and more profoundly convinced that a war is impossible between Mexico and the United States of America.

Yes, such a war is impossible, gentlemen; the sympathies of France for America, of America for France, the declarations of the government of the United States, principles, interests, everything is opposed to such a consummation.

In the very outset I reject the view entertained by the honorable M. Jules Favre, to the effect that, upon the cessation of the war, it will not be the armies of the United States that may invade Mexico, but bands of adventurers, who will renew those expeditions heretofore attempted against Cuba, and which, by the way, have succeeded so badly. So, without at all compromising America, a partisan warfare would arise—a war of guerillas, who would come to trouble the Mexican empire.

You have not sufficiently studied the character of the American war, when you make such an assertion as that. If, in the beginning of the war, when the enthusiasm was great, when the population had not been decimated, there had occurred a happy arrangement of the difficulties between the south and north, if this war had been all at once arrested in its course; yes, it might have been possible that adventurers, no longer finding any occupation in the bosom of America herself, might have recklessly and boldly thrown themselves upon the Mexican territory, and carried war with them. That might have been possible, I acknowledge. But such adventurers are no more; death has mowed down their ranks. Those who are now fighting in both armies are unfortunate workmen, unhappy laborers, torn from their homes by the conscription, and compelled to fight every day under the guidance of chiefs animated with fiercest passions!

As to these unfortunate soldiers, whenever peace comes between the south and the north, they will return to their deserted workshops, they will go back to their abandoned ploughshares, and they will not go in search of Mexican adventures. Believe me, whenever the proclamation of peace comes, their only thought will be to seek remuneration in some lucrative employment; for America, exhausted by long wars, can no longer find anywhere but in commerce and industry the means of regeneration, which are—I desire it with all my soul—to restore her to the rank of great nations. [Good! good! prolonged applause.]

And now, gentlemen, by what principles is the American government actuated? The honorable M. Jules Favre has thought proper to refer to certain despatches from the government of the United States, in which he believes that he finds the proof of a kind of conformity with the declarations made by the Congress of the United States.

Gentlemen, I have the despatches in my hands. Here is what I read in that of the 23d of October, 1863:

"The United States, desiring to conform themselves to the legitimate consequences of their own principles, can only leave the destiny of Mexico in the keeping of its own inhabitants, and acknowledge their sovereignty and their independence, under whatever form it pleases them to manifest that sovereignty and independence."

Such is the language held by Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton, and communicated to the minister of foreign affairs. Since then spontaneous explanations have been given to us in reference to that declaration of the Congress. The minister of foreign affairs has set down these explanations in a circular, addressed to all his agents, under date of May 4, 1864. I cannot do better than read it to you; from it you will be able to form an idea as to the

estimate to be set upon the uneasiness and the doubts manifested by the honorable M. Jules Favre:

"The recent vote of the House of Representatives of Washington, on the subject of Mexico, has given occasion for interpretations which it may not be uninteresting to rectify. It has been presumed apparently that this vote might induce the United States to adopt towards us a new attitude of such a nature as to change the friendly relations of the two countries, or to complicate at least the affairs of Mexico by external embarrassments. It suffices, however, to take into account the circumstances under which this manifestation has been produced, in order to understand that it is very far from having such importance. It is undoubtedly the reflexion of that sentiment which the American press sedulously maintains in the United States, and of which the tendency is to have considered as an indirect attack upon their rights any intervention whatever, no matter how legitimate it may be, by a European power on any point of the American continent. But, in the United States, more even than in any other country, the legislative power is allowed such demonstrations without thereby involving the government and obliging it to make those resolutions its rule of conduct. The Emperor's government could not, therefore, have entertained any apprehension in this regard, even though the incident had not been the object of any explanation on the part of the federal government; but the cabinet of Washington has deemed it proper to prevent of its own accord any impression of the kind that might have been made by it upon us. Mr. Dayton has come to read to me a despatch addressed to him by the Secretary of State of the Union, in order to relieve the cabinet of Washington from any responsibility in this affair, and to establish the point satisfactorily that a vote of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, or even of the two houses, although naturally recommending itself to respectful attention, yet does not at all oblige the cabinet to modify its policy or take away its liberty of action.

"Mr. Seward sees no reason to adopt a different policy in the Mexican question from that which he has hitherto pursued; and if his dispositions should change at any time, we would be informed of the fact directly and at a proper time, as also of his motives for such a change.

"I replied to Mr. Dayton, that, in our opinion, there would be no justification for such a change; that our confidence in the wisdom and enlightened views of the American cabinet was too great to allow us to attribute to it any idea of compromising the veritable interests of the United States by any imprudent acts.

"In expressing to Mr. Dayton the satisfaction felt by the Emperor's government at the assurances which he had been commissioned to make to it, I added that I thought, in fact, that from the point of view of the United States themselves, the choice could not be doubtful between the establishment in Mexico of a regular and stable government and the perpetuation of an anarchy, of which they had been the first to feel the serious inconveniences. The reorganization of an immense country, destined with the return of order and security to play an important economical part in the world, ought to be, for the United States above all, a real source of advantage, since it was a new market opened to them, and of which they would be called, more than others, on account of their proximity, to profit. The prosperity of Mexico was, therefore, in unison with their best interests, and I did not certainly believe that the cabinet of Washington could fail to recognize that truth.

"This reply to Mr. Dayton's communication and the fact of that communication itself indicate to you sufficiently, Mr. —, how it is proper to regard the circumstance to which I have deemed it my duty to call your attention."

Such is the declaration made by the American government, immediately after that of the House of Representatives. What has become of the latter declaration itself? The Senate indefinitely postponed its consideration.

And we must state, all those who have made themselves acquainted with American affairs understand the internal reasons that may have induced that resolution. A presidential contest is, at this moment, in progress in America, and every one, democrat and republican, is striving for popularity. [That is so; that is so.] And some think that they will attain their purpose by opposing the new American establishment. But, at bottom, the danger of a contest directed against Mexico is impossible, irreconcilable with the principles on which the United States rely.

How! Here is a country choosing by universal suffrage a form of government monarchical or republican, and in the name of national sovereignty, and yet the American army, it is supposed, would interfere in the states of Mexico, to impose—what? A different form from that adopted and proclaimed by the people!

Indeed, America would in that way violate the very essence of her government, liberty, and national sovereignty. She would not even have for her support that Monroe doctrine, so mistakenly quoted; for, to all those who have read the theories of President Monroe, they evidently amount only to one thing, to this declaration: that it would be regarded with disfavor if Europe established colonies in America, maintained territorial possessions there, and enjoyed such or such territories under title of conquest, and came, for instance, to convert Mexico into an Algeria placed under the sceptre of the Emperor. The Monroe doctrine is very pointedly directed against any such pretensions as these. It has established the principle—*Every one have his own; every one for himself.*

Are not the Mexicans in possession of their own? [That is it; good!] Does not Mexico, while exercising her sovereignty and choosing a prince for Emperor, perform an act of legitimate sovereignty? Is it a fact that there are any circumstances to constitute the Emperor of Mexico a mere lieutenant of the Emperor of the French? [That is clear enough.]

Let us, therefore, exclude those offensive and irritating expressions from our language. [Good!] The Emperor of Mexico is sovereign by the will of the Mexican people, and America will respect that will. Why should she not respect it? From the order, from the regularity, from the commercial prosperity of Mexico, America will derive more profit than any other nation. She it is who will most advantageously work out these industrial and commercial relations; she it is who will be able to send to the rich diggings of Sonora and Sinaloa the superfluous portion of her population to carry thither at once both labor and wealth. That which we might anticipate in our considerations, if such an anticipation should be entertained by serious and exalted minds, is in regard to the circumstances, necessary in the future, of a deep intimacy between Mexico and the United States of America. Therefore, America does not threaten the Emperor of Mexico, and that sovereign can proceed in his course; he may continue his efforts to prepare the prosperity of his country, and to mark the near approach of that prosperity by selecting the day on which to separate himself from the French flag in order to allow it to return with glory to our midst. [Good!]

This question of Mexico is now exhausted.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Romero.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 15, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 31st ultimo, transmitting translations of two discussions which have recently occurred in the corps legislatif of France, relative to Franco-Mexican affairs.

Thanking you for this attention, I have at the same time to acknowledge previous communications from you relating to the political condition of Mexico, which, with their accompanying documents, have contributed largely to my knowledge of passing events in that country. The notes, hitherto unanswered, are of the dates, respectively, of the 2d, 20th, 24th, and 26th February, and the 1st and 2d March last.

I beg to assure you of my high appreciation of the zeal and ability with which, from time to time, you have impressed this government as to the actual condition of the Mexican republic.

I avail myself of the occasion to renew to you, sir, the assurances of my distinguished consideration.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Señor MATIAS ROMERO, &c., &c., &c.

No. 12.—*Case of the Mexican brig Oriente.*

Mr. Barreda to Mr. Seward, (with two enclosures,) June 24, 1863.
Mr. Seward to Mr. Barreda, June 30, 1863.

Mr. Barreda to Mr. Seward.

NEWPORT, June 24, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to enclose a statement addressed to me by the Messrs. Echeverria & Co., of New York, agents of the owner of the Mexican schooner Oriente, with an account of the losses and damages which the latter claims.

Not knowing the antecedents of this affair, nor being in possession of documents relating to those losses and damages, my action is now limited to submitting to you the application of the claimant, trusting that you will give to it such just appreciation as it may deserve.

I reiterate to you the assurance of my distinguished consideration and respect.

F. L. BARREDA.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State of the United States, Washington, D. C.

To his Excellency FREDERICK L. BARREDA,
In charge of Mexican affairs:

The Mexican schooner Oriente, belonging to a citizen of and residing in Mexico, was seized and brought to the city of New Orleans in the month of June, 1862. The vessel was sent from that port to New York, where she arrived in the latter part of the same month.

A correspondence in relation to the schooner was had by his excellency Mr. Romero with his excellency Mr. Seward.

No libel or other proceedings in court were taken against the vessel, and, by direction of his excellency Mr. Seward, the schooner was discharged from custody about the middle of January of this year (1863) and delivered to us, the agents of the owner.

Mr. Seward informed Mr. Romero that the claim of the owner of the vessel for the damages he sustained could be ascertained by appraisers designated by the court, in case of the discharge of the vessel; but we are advised that, as the vessel was not brought into court in any manner, the court has no jurisdiction in the matter and will not assume any.

We, therefore, take the liberty of praying your excellency, in behalf of the owner of the vessel, to present to Mr. Seward the enclosed claim for damages, and request him to order the same paid.

We are your excellency's most obedient servants,

M. ECHEVERRIA & CO.,
Agents for the owners.

Claim of the owner of the Mexican schooner Oriente, for damages sustained by him by reason of the seizure of the vessel.

The vessel was seized June 18, 1862, and released from custody in January, 1863.

Loss of services of the vessel for seven months, at \$2,000 per month.....	\$14,000
Expenses of vessel and crew in New Orleans.....	1,000
Wages of captain and mate, board and passage to New York.....	1,000
Expense of sending home crew to Laguayra, there being no direct opportunity....	500
Legal expenses in New York and New Orleans.....	500
Damage and deterioration of cargo.....	3,000
Damages to vessel, and expenses to place her in the same condition as when seized	2,000
Goods and articles missing from vessel.....	300
Charges of agent in New York.....	1,000
	23,300

M. ECHEVERRIA & CO.,
Agents for the owners.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Barreda.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 30, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 24th instant, with the accompanying memorial of Messieurs. Echeverria & Company, of New York, agents of the owners of the Mexican brig Oriente, supplemental to one heretofore forwarded to this department on the 20th No-