

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FREE ZONE PAPER.

Since this paper went to press, the Congress of the United States has acted again on the Free Zone question, causing important congressional documents to come out, and the House of Representatives passed a Joint Resolution repealing the Joint Resolution of March 1st, 1898. I have also received valuable official information from the Mexican Government bearing on the amount of foreign merchandise, not from the United States, imported into the Free Zone, during the fiscal years 1895-96 and 1896-97. I have thought proper, therefore, to embrace that information, as well as the action of Congress and papers referred to, in the present supplement.

Foreign Commodities Imported into the Free Zone.—With a view of finding out the exact value of foreign merchandise, except the products and manufactures of the United States imported into the Mexican Free Zone, with the payment of eighteen and one half per cent. of the full import duties, and in that way show what is the exact amount of that trade, I requested the Mexican Government to prepare a statement of the extent of that trade from the official data furnished by the respective custom houses, which I received after my paper on the subject had been printed.

We have twelve custom houses on our frontier with the United States, between the mouth of the Rio Grande River and the Pacific Ocean. Seven of them, Mier, Guerrero, Camargo, Boquillas, La Morita, Tijuana and Sásabe imported during the two fiscal years 1895-96 and 1896-97 only foreign merchandise, the product and manufacture of the United States, and none from Europe or any other country. The importations from the other five custom houses were as follows:

| CUSTOM HOUSES. | YEARS. | VALUE. | 18½ PER CENT. OF DUTIES PAID. | TOTAL DUTIES. |
|----------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Matamoros | 1895-96 | \$49,124 | \$14,919.01 | \$80,643.33 |
| " | 1896-97 | | | |
| Laredo de Tamaulipas | 1895-96 | 210,862 | 48,530.31 | 262,326.00 |
| " | 1896-97 | | | |
| Piedras Negras: | | | | |
| (Ciudad Porfirio Diaz) | 1895-96 | 21,660 | 14,969.65 | 2,813.43 |
| " | 1896-97 | 34,620 | | 5,278.27 |
| El Paso del Norte ¹ : | | | | |
| (Ciudad Juarez) | 1895-96 | 102,507 | 18,643.14 | 100,773.70 |
| " | 1896-97 | | | |
| Nogales | 1895-96 | 41,460 | 15,388.57 | 75,164.26 |
| " | 1896-97 | 6,161 | | 8,017.21 |
| Total | | \$466,394 | \$112,450.68 | \$535,016.20 |

¹ In the figures of the El Paso del Norte custom house are embraced both the commodities imported from the United States and those arrived in transit from Veracruz, Tampico, and Guaymas.

I regret that the data sent by the Matamoros, Laredo, and El Paso del Norte custom houses do not state separately the importation of foreign merchandise not from the United States, during the fiscal years 1895-96 and 1896-97, but give the figures of both years together. To avoid the delay necessary to have this data revised, I will take as the importation of each year, one half of the importation of the two years. The total value of foreign merchandise, not produced or manufactured in the United States, imported into the Mexican Free Zone during the two years mentioned was \$466,394, which would give an average for one year of \$233,197. A large portion of these commodities, fifty per cent. of them at least, goes to places in Mexico outside of the Free Zone limits in so far as those imported by the Laredo and El Paso del Norte custom houses are concerned, and about twenty-five per cent. of those imported by the Piedras Negras and Nogales custom houses, leaving in those districts about seventy-five per cent.; and supposing that all the merchandise imported by the Matamoros custom house is consumed in the Free Zone of that locality, the value of the merchandise left in the Free Zone would be \$141,868. But out of this amount ought to be deducted such commodities as are consumed in the Free Zone, which would be at least fifty per cent., and that will leave \$70,934, which might be smuggled into the adjoining countries, the largest portion of which will likely go into Mexico; but supposing that all should be smuggled into the United States, which I consider is not at all probable, the value of merchandise smuggled into this country would have been \$70,934, which at the average rate of duty in the United States in the year ending June 30, 1896, was 39.95 per cent., and the average for the following year ending June 30, 1897, which was 42.17 per cent., making an average rate of 41.06 per cent. would amount \$29,125.50 as the loss suffered by the United States Treasury on account of the Mexican Free Zone.

Even supposing that all the commodities imported into the Mexican Free Zone should be smuggled into the United States, which is certainly almost an impossibility, because some of them are consumed in the Free Zone, and the largest portion if smuggled at all is smuggled into Mexico, the value of merchandise smuggled into this country during each of the mentioned fiscal years would be \$233,197, which at the average duty paid in this country during the said years of 41.06 per cent. would amount to \$95,750.97.

This information, which is official and therefore correct, corroborates Secretary of the Treasury Fairchild's Report of March 1, 1888, and which I give in full in the foregoing paper, and sustains my contention of how much the smuggling which can be carried on from Mexico to the United States on account of the Free Zone has been exaggerated, even in case that every cent of European manufactures imported to the Free Zone was smuggled into this country.

Action of the Fifty-fifth Congress on the Free Zone.—The members of Congress from Texas renewed their efforts during the 1st Session of the Fifty-fifth Congress to repeal the Joint Resolution approved March 1, 1895, forbidding the transportation of goods in bond into the Free Zone of Mexico, and Mr. Samuel B. Cooper, representing the 2d District of Texas, introduced by request on March 20, 1897,¹ a Joint Resolution to that effect, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed. As the 1st Session of the Fifty-fifth Congress was specially devoted to the tariff, and for that reason the Speaker did not appoint any committees until the end of the session, excepting the one on Ways and Means, who had to report the tariff bill, this Committee did not take any action on Mr. Cooper's resolution until the 2d Session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, when, on March 11, 1898, it was favorably reported by the Committee, referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed. When the Committee had thus to take some action on the subject of the Free Zone, not being familiar with the bearings of that institution on the interests of the United States, they addressed, on January 21, 1898, a communication to the Secretary of the Treasury, asking his views on said resolution.

Secretary Gage sent to the Hon. Nelson Dingley, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, on January 26, 1898,² his

¹ Fifty-fifth Congress, 2d Session, H. Res. 27. [Report No. 702.] In the House of Representatives, March 20, 1897, Mr. Cooper of Texas, (by request) introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed. March 11, 1898, referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

"Joint resolution. To repeal the joint resolution in reference to the Free Zone:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution in reference to the Free Zone along the northern frontier of Mexico and adjacent to the United States,' approved March first, eighteen hundred and ninety-five, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and the full operation of section three thousand and five of the Revised Statutes as existing prior to the adoption of such joint resolution is hereby revived."

² "TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., January 26, 1898.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a letter, dated the 21st instant, from the clerk of your committee, with which was transmitted, for an expression of my views thereon, House joint resolution 27, providing for the repeal of the joint resolution in reference to the Free Zone.

"On the 2d of February last, in reply to a letter from you, inclosing, for an expression of the views of this Department thereon, House joint resolution 222, which is substantially the same as that under consideration, you were advised that there is abundant opportunity for the perpetration of frauds on the revenue by reason of the Free Zone of Mexico, and until the privileges pertaining to said Zone are abolished

answer to the Committee's inquiries, stating that on the 2d of February, 1897, he had given the views of the Department on the Joint Resolution introduced for the same purpose by Mr. Cobb on December 18, 1896, and he repeated his opinion that the only practical result of the Act of March 1, 1895, "had been the loss of business to American railway companies by reason of the diversion of the traffic to points in the Free Zone, by way of Mexican seaports." He also reiterated such views as he had expressed before, to the effect that he saw no objection to the passage of Mr. Cooper's Joint Resolution. Secretary Gage's letter, expressing the views of the Treasury Department officials, further stated "that there is abundant opportunity for the perpetration of frauds on the revenue by reason of the Free Zone of Mexico, and that until the privileges pertaining to the said Zone are abolished by the Mexican Government, the danger to the revenue will continue to exist."

Mr. James L. Slayden, another member of Congress from Texas, representing the 12th Congressional District, embracing San Antonio, introduced in the House of Representatives, on January 31, 1898,¹ during its 2d Session, a Joint Resolution, having in view the same object as Mr. Cooper's, namely, to repeal the Joint Resolution approved March 1, 1895, forbidding the transportation of goods in bond to the Free Zone in Mexico, and his resolution was also referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

General Grosvenor, a member of the Committee, to whom both resolutions were referred, introduced in the House on February 16,

by the Mexican Government the danger to the revenue will continue to exist. The opinion was also expressed that the only practical result of the legislation which it is intended to repeal has been loss of business to American railway companies by reason of the diversion of the traffic to points in the Free Zone by way of Mexican seaports. The views then expressed are reiterated, and I see no objection to the passage of House resolution No. 27.

"Respectfully yours,
"L. J. GAGE, Secretary."

"HON. NELSON DINGLEY,
"Chairman Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives."

¹ Fifty-fifth Congress, 2d Session, H. Res. 139. In the House of Representatives, January 31, 1898, Mr. Slayden introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

"Joint Resolution. To repeal joint resolution numbered twenty, approved March first, eighteen hundred and ninety-five, forbidding the transportation of goods in bond to the Free Zone in Mexico.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That joint resolution numbered twenty, approved March first, eighteen hundred and ninety-five, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend the operation of section three thousand and five of the Revised Statutes, having reference to the transportation of goods, wares, and merchandise in bond to the Free Zone in Mexico be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

1898,¹ on behalf of that Committee, a Resolution asking "the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the House whether frauds upon the customs of the United States have been, and are being, committed through the Free Zone of Mexico by reason of the existence of the same and the existing laws and regulations, and if so, that said Secretary report what, if any, change in law or regulations is necessary to protect the revenues of the United States from such frauds."

General Grosvenor's Resolution having been approved by the House after some explanations made by him, the Secretary of the Treasury answered the same, in a communication addressed on March 11, 1898,²

¹ Fifty-fifth Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives. Resolution No. 226. In the House of Representatives. February 16, 1898.—Ordered to be printed. Mr. Grosvenor submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is, requested to inform the House whether frauds upon the customs of the United States have been, and are being, committed through the Free Zone of Mexico, or by reason of the existence of the same and the existing laws and regulations, and if so, that said Secretary report what, if any, change in law or regulations is necessary to protect the revenues of the United States from such frauds."

² Fifty-fifth Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives. Document No. 342. Mexico Free Zone. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a reply to the House resolution of the 16th ultimo in regard to frauds upon the customs through the Free Zone of Mexico. March 14, 1898.—Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 11, 1898.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of copy of a resolution, dated the 16th ultimo, of the House of Representatives, wherein I am directed to inform the House whether frauds upon the customs of the United States have been and are being committed through the free zone of Mexico or by reason of the existence of the same, and the existing laws and regulations; and, if so, that I report what, if any, changes in law or regulations are necessary to protect the revenues of the United States from such frauds.

"In reply I have to state that no doubt there is opportunity for the perpetration of frauds upon the revenue by reason of the continuance of the free zone of Mexico, and until the privileges pertaining to said zone are abolished by the Mexican Government the danger to our revenue will continue to exist. On March 1, 1895, a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend the operation of section 3005, Revised Statutes, in so far as the same permits goods, wares, and merchandise to be transported in bond through the United States into the free zone of Mexico so long as said zone exists, was approved, but the only apparent result of such resolution has been loss of business to American railway companies, by reason of the diversion of the traffic to places in the free zone by way of Mexican seaports. In March, 1888, an investigation was made with the view to ascertaining the value of merchandise which passed through the United States to Mexico during the preceding year. As a result of the inquiries it was found that the total value of foreign merchandise passing in transit was \$497,654, and in addition to that amount merchandise of the value of

to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in which he reiterated his views "that there is opportunity for the perpetration of frauds on the revenue of the United States by reason of the continuance of the Free Zone of Mexico, and that until the privileges pertaining to the said Zone are abolished by the Mexican Government the danger to our revenue will continue to exist." I have to remark that the Secretary of the Treasury only said that dangers existed for the perpetration of frauds, and he did not aver that frauds were actually perpetrated, as was the ground taken by his predecessors. Secretary Gage also reiterated in that report the views expressed in his former letter of January 26, 1898, that "the adoption of the Resolution of March 1, 1895, has caused a loss of business to American railway companies by reason of the diversion of the traffic to points in the Free Zone by way of Mexican seaports." Secretary Gage referred also to the Report of Secretary Fairchild of March 1, 1898, which I have given in full in the foregoing paper, and stated that "the official records of the frontier ports, while showing the quantity and value of goods exported to Mexico, do not indicate the proportionate quantity or value of the merchandise sent to the Free Zone of Mexico," and concluded by saying that he was not prepared to suggest any changes in the existing law regulations which may be necessary to protect the revenues of the United States from the perpetration of frauds with the existence of the Free Zone of Mexico.

\$194,774 was withdrawn from warehouse and exported to Mexico, making a total of \$692,428, of which \$211,589 was dutiable.

"Since the passage of the joint resolution above referred to, no merchandise is forwarded through the United States to places in the free zone under the regulations which were made pursuant to the provisions of section 3005 of the Revised Statutes, but goods destined for Mexico arriving at the seaports are allowed to be forwarded to ports on the Southwestern frontier after appraisement and entry at the port of first arrival. Entry of such merchandise for exportation to Mexico is made at the port of exit. The official records of said ports, while showing the quantity and value of goods exported to Mexico, do not indicate the proportionate quantity or value of the merchandise sent to the free zone of that country. This information, if desired, may be obtained by special inquiries at the several ports on the Southwestern border.

"In reply to the request for a report as to any changes in existing law or regulations which may be necessary to protect the revenues of the United States from the perpetration of frauds through the existence of the free zone of Mexico, I have to state that officers of this department stationed on the border have from time to time been instructed to be specially vigilant in protecting the revenue against the unlawful introduction of goods from places in the free zone, and I am unable to indicate any measure which would afford additional protection to the revenues of the United States against the smuggling of merchandise from the free zone. I am, however, of opinion that the joint resolution approved March 1, 1895, should be repealed.

"Respectfully yours,

"L. J. GAGE, Secretary."

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES."

When I saw in the *Congressional Record* of February 16, 1898, Mr. Grosvenor's Resolution, I thought it proper to submit both to Mr. Grosvenor himself, and to the Secretary of the Treasury, the press proofs of my paper on the Free Zone, as it contained full and impartial statements on the subject, and in doing so I informed both of them that I was well aware that I had no right to interfere in the internal legislation of this country, and that therefore I did not ask for nor suggest anything at all, my object being merely to allow them the opportunity of reading a complete, and, in my opinion, impartial statement of the Free Zone question, so that they could understandingly make up their minds on the subject and arrive at a fair and just conclusion.

My paper does not seem to have made much impression upon Secretary Gage, if he really had an opportunity of reading it carefully, as, after it had been in his possession several days, he reiterates in his Report of March 11, 1898, the same views that he and his predecessors had before expressed upon the opportunity of committing frauds upon the revenue of the United States as allowed by the Mexican Free Zone.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House did me the honor to ask my consent to insert in their Report my paper on the Free Zone, and as my object in writing and publishing it was to dispel misapprehensions existing here on that subject, which were in the way of a better understanding between the two countries, I was very glad that my paper should be published in an official document, as in that way it could be within the reach of Senators, Members of Congress, and other high officials of this Government, for whose benefit it was specially written.

The Committee on Ways and Means presented on March 11, 1898,¹

¹ Fifty-fifth Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives. Report No. 702. Mexican Free Zone. March 11, 1898, referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed. Mr. Grosvenor, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report. [To accompany H. Res. 27.]

"The Committees on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 27) 'to repeal the joint resolution in reference to the Free Zone,' having had the same under consideration, beg leave to report:

"By section 3005 of the Revised Statutes, the right of 'free' transportation in bond is accorded to adjoining countries through the United States and upon its railroads and other transportation systems, under regulations made by the Secretary of the Treasury. This right extended to the Republic of Mexico. The Republic of Mexico, in the exercise of its sovereignty, created a district of territory along its entire frontier bordering on the United States, about 13 miles wide, in which territory goods and merchandise were and are admitted free of duty. It is called and known as the 'Free Zone' or 'Zona Libre.' This right of shipment was enjoyed until March 1 1895, when a joint resolution was passed authorizing and directing the Secre-

their Report on Mr. Cooper's Resolution, and that Report was accompanied by the Secretary of the Treasury's letter of January 26, 1898, to which I have already referred, and by my paper on the Free Zone as it appears in this book.

The House of Representatives repeals the Joint Resolution of March 1st, 1895.—On May 4, 1898, Mr. Grosvenor on behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives moved to consider Mr. Cooper's resolution. Messrs. Grosvenor, Dingley, and Slayden sustained the privileged character of the resolution, while the motion was opposed by three representatives from Texas, Messrs. Lanham, Bailey, and Stephens, who contended that the resolution was not privileged; but the Speaker having decided in favor of the Committee's tary of the Treasury to suspend this right so far as the Free Zone was concerned, and in pursuance thereof the Secretary did suspend said right.

"The reason for the passage of that joint resolution (vol. 28, United States Statutes at Large, page 973, No. 23) was to prevent what was represented as a large 'smuggling' trade back into the United States from the 'free' goods admitted into this zone. Earnest protest was at the time made against the passage of the resolution, and for the facts bearing upon the matter reference is here made to *Congressional Record*, volume 27, part 4, page 2850 et. seq., Fifty-third Congress, third session. Since that time three years have elapsed, and the purpose for which the resolution was passed shows that it has failed. Mexico has not repealed the 'Free Zone,' and the United States has not been better protected. On the contrary, the only effect of the resolution has been to drive from our own transportation lines a large traffic into European and foreign lines—a very large and profitable business—without any return whatever. The goods that should and would be shipped in bond over our lines into the territory of Mexico are now shipped by vessels to Vera Cruz and other Mexican ports, in foreign bottoms, and over the Mexican railroads into the Free Zone, thus depriving our railroads of their legitimate business. These facts have been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury and his opinion taken upon the adoption of the resolution now before the committee, and he sees no objection to such action. His letter, dated January 26, 1898, addressed to Hon. Nelson Dingley, Chairman Committee on Ways and Means, is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

"We therefore recommend the adoption of the joint resolution (No. 27) now before the Committee, and report the same back to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

"The subject of the Free Zone, with its history and the variety of historical data connected therewith, is a very interesting subject; and inasmuch as it affects the relations between this Government and the Republic of Mexico, and inasmuch as the whole subject-matter is one of great interest, the committee have seen fit to embody in this report a very able and comprehensive paper prepared by Señor Don Matias Romero, the distinguished representative of the Republic of Mexico at this capital. That gentleman has had ample opportunity to know whereof he writes in this behalf, having been a member of the Mexican Government and intimate with everything connected with the subject. Your committee take pleasure, therefore, with the consent of that distinguished gentleman, in here presenting his paper as a part of this report. It is taken from the proofs of a series of papers bearing on the relations between Mexico and the United States that the Mexican minister is now about to publish in book form.

contention, the resolution was taken up and passed in Committee of the Whole. During the short discussion which took place previous to the passage of the resolution, the members from Texas representing the districts adjoining the Mexican frontier were in favor of the same, excepting Mr. Stephens, who contended that Mr. Cooper favored it because it only benefitted the railroads to the prejudice of the merchants on the frontier. Messrs. Slayden and Kleberg, the two representing the districts in Texas bordering on the Rio Grande, excepting El Paso represented by Mr. Stephens, contended that the Joint Resolution of March 1, 1895, had injured the interests not only of the United States railways but of the local merchants on the border, and that they all were anxious for the repeal of such Joint Resolution.

Mr. Slayden considered the Mexican Free Zone as a real advantage to the United States and expressed a desire that it should be extended to a larger area, so as to increase its benefits,¹ and that is the first time that I have heard an American statesman express an opinion on that subject which agrees entirely with mine. Mr. Lanham objected to the consideration of the resolution, but did say that he was not opposed to it although he finally so voted, and the only one who spoke against it was Mr. Stephens, who contended that his constituents objected to the resolution.

Mr. Stephens's only argument worthy of such a name was that, under the present conditions, the United States merchants on the frontier had the advantage of low freight rates, because there are several competing lines to the respective border towns, while the merchants on the Mexican side of the frontier, having only one line to each town, pay high rates over the Mexican roads for want of competition, and that it was not wise to give the Mexican merchants the advantage of low freight rates obtained by the United States merchants resulting from the present law. But supposing that it would be a sound principal to regulate railway freight rates by the nationality of the shippers, Mr. Stephens did not take into consideration the fact that the haul from Tampico to El Paso, Mexico, which is the furthest town on the frontier from the Atlantic seaboard, is about one third of the distance of the haul from New York to El Paso, Texas, and that the Mexican railroads are interested in establishing their freights in such a way

¹ The following is an extract from Mr. Slayden's speech relating to this subject:

"MR. SPEAKER: So far from desiring the abolition of the Free Zone, I would, if I could, exercise any influence whatever upon the Mexican Government, ask it to extend that zone three, four, or five hundred miles farther back. This territory adjacent to us has a duty of only 17½ per cent. of the normal Mexican duty; and on the other side it backs up against a part of Mexico which has a tremendously high duty, so that the extension of this Free Zone would certainly be a benefit to the trade of this country. Therefore, I say that so far from asking the abolition of the Free Zone, I would vastly prefer to have it extended farther back into the interior."

as to encourage instead of destroying their business, which would be the result if exorbitantly high rates were collected.

Mr. Stephens brought my paper on the Free Zone into the discussion, saying that I criticized General Grant and Mr. Blaine on account of their views on the Free Zone, while I only stated their action on the subject without commenting on it at all. Mr. Grosvenor closed the discussion, making a very clear, concise, and conclusive speech; the vote resulted in the approval of the resolution by forty-eight votes against four. Mr. Grosvenor mentioned the fact that two different Secretaries of the Treasury had expressed their opinion in favor of the repeal of the resolution of March 1, 1895. He also recognized the right of the Mexican Government to establish the Free Zone, saying: "It is a matter that the United States Government cannot control. It is the prerogative of the sovereignty of the Mexican Republic. . . . This is a matter for her. It is not our revenue. It does not in that way affect our revenue, theoretically, at least." Although Mr. Grosvenor stated that he was himself against the Free Zone.

Mr. Stephens seemed to be under the impression that the Committee on Ways and Means had asked my opinion on the subject, and that I had written an argument for their benefit, and under that supposition he complained that his side had not been heard. Mr. Grosvenor disposed conclusively of that contention, stating what appears from my paper, namely, that it was written and published long before the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fifty-fifth Congress took up that matter, and is only a review of the whole question, stating the contention on both sides, for the benefit of those who desire reliable information on the subject.

It is a fact which cannot be denied that the Joint Resolution of March 1, 1895, was passed with the object of inducing Mexico to abolish the Free Zone, and as such object has not been obtained it is beyond all question that the purpose of that legislation has entirely failed and brought about only injury to the railways and merchants of the United States, a point which Mr. Grosvenor made very clear in his remarks.

Far from having any interest in the repeal of the Joint Resolution of March 1, 1895, Mexico would rather let it remain in force, as it constitutes a real benefit to the Mexican railways. I personally was pleased to see the tenor and result of the discussion in the House, because it showed me that the question was treated more intelligently than ever before, and because it showed a more friendly sentiment toward Mexico than on former occasions. Mr. Slayden qualified in his speech the Joint Resolution of March 1, 1896, as a "deliberate affront by a petty annoyance to the Republic of Mexico, which lies on yonder side of the Rio Grande."

The Joint Resolution as approved by the House of Representatives passed to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance, but as the Senate has had very important matters to consider during the present session, especially those affecting the war with Spain, the House Resolution has not been taken up in the Senate up to the time that this paper goes to press. I would like to give here the outcome of this incident, that is, the final action of Congress on the pending Joint Resolution; but I am afraid that under the present political conditions of this country no conclusion will be reached for some time, and it would not be reasonable to delay indefinitely the printing of this volume in expectation of such action.

As this paper goes to press the fifty-fifth Congress of the United States has closed its second Session without the Senate having taken any action on the Joint Resolution approved by the House of Representatives to repeal the Joint Resolution of April 1, 1896.

LIST OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES ON MEXICO SENT TO CONGRESS
DURING THE PERIOD OF THE FRENCH INTERVENTION, FROM
1861 TO 1867, PREPARED BY MR. CLIFFORD WARREN, ASSISTANT
LIBRARIAN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

1861.

Official instructions from Secretary of State William H. Seward to Hon. Thomas Corwin, the United States Minister to Mexico, dated April 6, 1861:

"Taking into view the actual condition and circumstances of Mexico, as well as those of the United States, the President is fully satisfied that the safety, welfare, and happiness of the latter would be more effectually promoted if the former should retain its complete integrity and independence, than they could be by any dismemberment of Mexico, with a transfer or diminution of its sovereignty, even though thereby a portion or the whole of the country or its sovereignty should be transferred to the United States themselves. . . . Mexico really has, or ought to have, no enemies. The world is deeply interested in the development of her agricultural, and especially her mineral and commercial, resources, while it holds in high respect the simple virtues and heroism of her people, and, above all, their inextinguishable love of civil liberty.

"The President, therefore, will use all proper influence to favor the restoration of order and authority in Mexico. . . . If, on the other hand, it shall appear in the sequel that the Mexican people are only now resting a brief season to recover their wasted energies sufficiently to lacerate themselves with new domestic conflicts, then it is to be feared that not only the Government of the United States but many other governments will find it impossible to prevent a resort to that magnificent country of a class of persons, unhappily too numerous everywhere, who are accustomed to suppose that visionary schemes of public interest, aggrandizement, or reform will justify even lawless invasion and aggression.

"For a few years past, the condition of Mexico has been so unsettled as to raise the question on both sides of the Atlantic whether the time has not come when some foreign power ought, in the general interest of society, to intervene to establish a protectorate or some other form of government in that country and guaranty its continuance there. Such schemes may even now be held under consideration by some European nations. . . . You will not fail to assure the Government of Mexico that the President neither has, nor can ever have, any sympathy with such designs, in whatever quarter they may arise or whatever character they may take on." (Foreign Relations, 1861, pages 65-70, Senate Executive Document No. 1, 37th Congress, 2d Session. 6 pages.)