EDITED BY THOMAS RITCHIE.

THOMAS RITCHIE & JOHN P. HEISS,
PROPRIETORS AND PUBLISHERS.

TERMS.

Daily,	per year, for one copy	$10 00
"	" five copies	40 00
Tri-Weekly,	" one copy	5 00
"	" five copies	20 00
"	" ten copies	35 00
Weekly	" one copy	2 00
"	" five copies	8 00
"	" ten copies	15 00

The name of no person will be entered upon our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.

Distant subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage on which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in its safe transmission.

The country paper will be published tri-weekly during the sessions of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscribers will be notified some days in advance of the time when their subscriptions will expire.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on terms proportioned to the above annual rates.

A postmaster's certificate of remittances in payment for subscriptions or advertisements will be a sufficient receipt therefor. The notes of any specie-paying bank will be received.

PRICES FOR ADVERTISING.

Twelve lines, or less, three insertions - $1 00
Every additional insertion - 25
Longer advertisements charged in proportion.
A liberal discount made to those who advertise by the year.

The Daily Union.

VOLUME I. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 268.

WASHINGTON CITY, THURSDAY NIGHT, MARCH 12, 1846.

CONGRESSIONAL.

REMARKS OF MR. HANNEGAN, OF INDIANA,

In the Senate, February 16, 1846—On the resolution of notice of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and on the resolutions relative to Oregon, which he had previously submitted, and the amendment thereto as a substitute, proposed by Mr. Calhoun.

At 1 o'clock the Senate proceeded to the discussion of the special order, being the joint resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations, proposing to give notice to Great Britain of the intention of this government to annul the treaty for the joint occupation of the Oregon territory, and the resolutions of Messrs. Hannegan, Calhoun, and Crittenden having relation to the same subject. The question immediately pending was the amendment of Mr. Crittenden, which being announced—

Mr. HANNEGAN then rose and addressed the Senate as follows: Mr. President, there are various propositions relating to the subject of Oregon now before the Senate for its consideration, which propositions have been already fully and clearly stated by the presiding officer of this body; to any one of which, or all of them, if I correctly understand the rules of the Senate, it will be in order to speak. As far as the resolution for giving notice of the termination of the joint occupancy of Oregon is concerned, it is a matter of very little consequence whether the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations or the resolution offered by the senator from Kentucky, [Mr. Crittenden,] shall prevail. Either one or the other will satisfy me. But I consider the giving of the notice at the present session of Congress a matter of the utmost importance in many points of view. It will be entirely unnecessary, however, to discuss those various points, and, indeed, it would not be consistent with the course which I have marked out for myself. I desire to speak more particularly upon some other branches of the subject, and especially in reference to the resolutions which I had the honor to submit, and the amendment to those resolutions, or substitute for them, proposed by the honorable senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Calhoun.] I prefer this course for the simple reason that the resolutions which I submitted bring the whole question of Oregon directly before the Senate. My first resolution declares our title to the whole of the territory, extending them from the Rocky mountains to the Pacific ocean, and lying south of 54° 40′ north latitude, to be valid and unquestionable; in the second resolution I declare that this government has no power to alienate its soil, or to transfer the allegiance of its citizens, to any foreign prince or power; and by the third resolution it is declared to be in direct violation of the honor and best interests of the country to surrender that which is clearly ours. In amendment to these resolutions, the senator from South Carolina has submitted the following:

Resolved, That the President of the United States has power, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur."

Resolved, That the power of making treaties embraces that of settling and fixing boundaries between the territories and possessions of the United States and those of other powers, in cases of conflicting claims between them in reference to the same.

Resolved, That, however clear their claims may be, in their opinion, to "the country included within the parallels of 42 deg. and 54 deg. 40 min. north latitude, and extending from the Rocky mountains to the Pacific ocean, known as the territory of Oregon," there now exists, and have long existed, conflicting claims to the possession of the same between them and Great Britain, the adjustment of which has been frequently the subject of negotiation between the respective governments.

And also Mr. Calhoun's fifth resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States, in renewing the offer, in the spirit of peace and compromise, to establish the 49th degree of north latitude as a line between the two countries to the said territory, did not abandon the honor, the character, or the best interests of the American people, or exceed the power vested in him by the constitution to make treaties.

To this last resolution I have no answer to make. I shall not attempt to consider it in any way. To the first resolution I have no earthly objection. All that is substantial in it is in accordance with the letter and spirit of the constitution.

The second resolution of the senator from South Carolina contains some undoubted truth, but it is not applicable at all to the subject of Oregon. I desire the Senate to observe that the senator from South Carolina, not only in this resolution, but elsewhere in his resolutions, uses the word "claims" as applicable to the pretensions of both countries. I use the word *title* when speaking of the United States. I think his second resolution utterly inapplicable here, from the fact that his entire series does not present the question in its true attitude. We set up no claim—we assert title, the freehold, the sovereignty. It is England alone that rests upon a naked claim.

To this hour she never has succeeded in showing even "a colorable title" to one single foot; whilst upon the other hand, I hold that our negotiators, our executive department, both branches of Congress, hundreds of our fellow-citizens all over the Union, have at various intervals, and in rapid succession, made out and exhibited to the world as clear a case of title to the country between the parallels of 42° and 54° 40′ on the Pacific, with the adjacent islands, as was ever made out to the soil and freehold of any country on earth—as clear as can be made out by any member of this body to the plantation on which stands his habitation.

Without losing any time by prefatory remarks, I will go at once into the evidence of the title, which has already been presented on several occasions.

To avoid stopping in the course of my remarks to name authorities, I may now simply state in advance, that the sources from whence my information is chiefly derived are the works of Malte Brun and Humboldt, the writings of several heads of the State Department, the speeches delivered in this body, and the other branch, by various distinguished men, for the last twenty-five years, and from the work of, and conversations with, the commander of the exploring squadron, Captain Charles Wilkes, and also from the personal communications of Commodores Jones and Aulick, both of whom have visited a portion of the coast in question.

Humboldt informs us that in the year 1582, Francisco Gali, in his voyage from Macao to Acapulco, discovered the northwest coast of America as high as 57° 30′. In the language of this author, "Gali admired, like all those who since his time have visited New Cornwall, the beauty of those colossal mountains of which the summit is covered with perpetual snow, while their bottom is covered with the most beautiful vegetation."

New Cornwall, as it was called long after, if I recollect right, by Vancouver, extends from the 54th degree to the 57th. This discovery by Gali was ten years anterior to the voyage of Juan de Fuca, who discovered the strait separating the southern point of Vancouver's island from the main land. Whilst giving implicit credence to the discoveries of Gali, Humboldt, for reasons I cannot discover, is inclined to treat the voyage of Juan de Fuca as apocryphal. The examinations of modern times have united a concurrent support of de Fuca's statements, and with one accord the strait he discovered perpetuates his name. This voyage of de Fuca was in 1592. Subsequent to that time, and up to the period of 1774, Spain continued on various occasions to send mariners into those seas as high north as the parallels of 55° and 57°. Throughout the whole period she was, by the common consent of Christendom, regarded as the sovereign and possessor, not only to the last-named parallel, but still further to the north.

In the year 1774, however, occurred the voyage of Juan Perez, under the authority of the Spanish government, to a point between the parallels of 55° and 56°.

He landed on the north coast of Washington island, traded with the natives, took possession formally in the name of the king of Spain, coasted down it, and thence to Vancouver's island, along which he coasted, landing and trading with the natives, and was the first civilized man who discovered or entered Nootka sound, where he anchored, and christened it Port San Lorenzo, in honor of the saint on whose natal day he entered it. The year following his return, the Spanish viceroy of Mexico fitted out another expedition, the command of which was assigned to Bruno Heceta, accompanied by Perez and Quadra, and they proceeded to the 57th degree north. They erected monuments, affixed to them inscriptions, raised crosses, traded with the natives, and took possession in the name of the king of Spain, of the whole country south of the 57th parallel. In so doing, they complied with all the formalities known to the age, and upon the principles which have guided the course of England on more than one occasion. These two voyages would alone constitute a perfect title by discovery. This last voyage, commanded by Heceta, was two years prior to the voyage of Captain Cook, on whose discoveries the English claim now rests. At one time she defended her claim under the piratical voyage of Sir Francis Drake, to the Spanish possessions on the Pacific; history, however, has long since assigned to that renowned freebooter his appropriate place. Pillage and plunder were his incentives, not the discovery and acquisition of territory. It is exceedingly doubtful whether he proceeded as high north as 48°. As the claim under his discovery is abandoned, it would be useless to give it further notice.

In opposition to the conceded discoveries of Spain, England, at this day, comes in with the voyage of Captain Cook, the Nootka Sound convention, and the voyage of Vancouver. A sufficient answer to the claim under Cook, is founded in the well-authenticated fact, admitted by Cook himself, that prior to sailing from England an account of the voyage of Heceta had been published by Quadra, and had been seen by Cook. This simple statement of fact is the most decisive and complete refutation of the English claim by discovery.

Her claims under the Nootka Sound convention are no better founded. In the year 1789, an English subject named Meares landed at Nootka sound, and erected some huts for the purpose of trading with the natives; and shortly after an English vessel coming in, was seized by the Spaniards who had a settlement there. Meares was sent in confinement to Mexico, and the ships and cargo were confiscated. An appeal was made to the English government by Meares, for her protection and interposition; and, to her honor be it spoken, that appeal is never made in vain. She promptly addressed the Spanish government; and Spain, in reply, alleged that an English subject had trespassed on her dominions. England armed, and threatened instant hostilities unless Spain would make reparation for the alleged injury. Spain, weak as she was, and controlled at that time by the weakest and most imbecile monarch that has dishonored a throne in modern times, who was himself infamously controlled by the notorious and abandoned Godoy, miscalled Prince of Peace—even Spain, in her degradation, refused the arbitrary exactions of England. An appeal, under the "family compact," was made to France by the Spanish minister, Count Nunez, demanding assistance and support, in accordance with the terms of that compact. The reply of France was, that she was ready to meet and discharge her obligations under the "family compact." The unsettled condition of her affairs prevented the aid that was invoked, for the flame was already kindling which, three short years after, brought Louis XVI to the block. Left alone, weak and feeble as she was, Spain could not, single-handed, encounter the colossal power of England, and was compelled to submit to terms.

But, in so doing, she maintained to the last the tone of her minister in addressing the French government for aid. That communication appealed to all Europe for the justification of her title to the territory in question. Its language is vigorous and remarkable, and defies refutation. With the permission of the Senate, I will read a passage from that communication. Here it is:

"1st. That by the treaties, demarkations, takings of possession, and the most decided acts of sovereignty exercised by the Spaniards in these stations from the reign of Charles the second, and authorized by that monarch in 1692, the original vouchers for which shall be brought forward in the course of the negotiation, all the coast to the north of the western America, on the side of the south sea, as far as beyond what is called Prince William's sound, which is in the 61st degree, is acknowledged to belong exclusively to Spain."

"3d. That the state of the possessions and exclusive commerce on the seacoast of the southern ocean, as it existed in the time of Charles the second, had been acknowledged and defined anew by all the nations of Europe, and more particularly by England, in the eighth article of the treaty of Utrecht."

Mr. President, every communication which subsequently passed from Count Florida Blanca, the Spanish negotiator, to Mr. Fitzherbert, the English envoy, contains language equally, if not more decided, in the assertion of Spanish title, than the passage I have quoted. And at the very moment of signing the Nootka Sound convention, to avoid all subsequent fraudulent interpretation, and in defiance of the gauntletted hand impending over her, Count Florida Blanca declares that Spain yields not one tittle of sovereignty—of exclusive sovereignty over the soil.

If we add to this, and the common consent of Christendom before alluded to, the fact, that Mr. Fitzherbert made no assertion of title for England, but confined himself to a vague and undefined expression of rights, or "claims," up to the time of accepting the convention on behalf of England, we have as clear a title in Spain to Vancouver's island, and the adjacent coast and islands, as can be found in history, to the attachment of any newly discovered country on earth. That admission of right in Spain extended as high north as the 61st parallel.

Oh, what a picture would the secret history of English diplomacy present! I speak not in censure of the master-spirits who for centuries have controlled her councils, leading her step by step to the mastery of the world. Their far-sightedness, and their devotion to her interests, is worthy of commendation and emulation. Perhaps no stronger instance of forecast was ever given than that which sixty years ago saw the vast importance that the desert coast of the Pacific was ultimately to attain in the scale of empire.

"The Nootka Sound convention gave to England the right "to land on the coasts in places not already occupied, for the purpose of carrying on their commerce with the natives of the country, or of making settlements there," with the sole intention of affording her facilities in such intercourse with the natives and to enable her to repair her vessels. These secondary and permissive rights, in no manner involving the sovereignty, were all she acquired by that convention—all that her statesmen then claimed—all that Spain conceded. And yet she has at this hour the effrontery to assert, in the face of history, that she thus acquired the right of paramount occupation and settlement. I say *all* that her statesmen claimed; for Mr. Fox, in the British Parliament, whilst the convention was under discussion, denounced it as "*a treaty of concessions and not of acquisitions.*" In another passage he asserts, that "we had given up all right to settle except for temporary purposes, to the south of the Spanish settlements or in the intervals between them, where they happened to be distant."—*Par. His. vol.* 28, p 995.

And in confirmation of this language, Mr. Pitt, under whose auspices as prime minister the convention had been negotiated, replied by saying, that England "had gained no new rights, but that she had gained new advantages." These new advantages, in the language of Mr. Pitt, consisted simply in the acknowledgment by Spain "of the right of England to carry on fisheries in the Pacific ocean, and to trade on the coast of any part of it northwest of America."

Immediately after the execution of this convention, England fitted out one or two ships, and intrusted the command to Captain Vancouver, to proceed on a voyage of discovery—yes, of discovery to the Pacific ocean, and, as is alleged, to procure restitution of English property in compliance with the convention. What were the occurrences of that voyage? If Spain had intended, by this convention, to deliver Nootka sound to England, or if England had understood it as thus acquired, would it not have been promptly enforced by the one, if refused by the other? Most assuredly. But what is the fact? When Vancouver reached Nootka sound, did he make any demand for restoration? None that I ever heard of. And if so, it was not complied with; for so far from delivering to him possession of Nootka sound, which is between the parallels of 49° and 50°, the Spanish commandant refused to allow him to proceed around the island of Quadra or Vancouver, by the straits of Fuca, the gulf of Georgia, and Queen Charlotte's sound, which all combine to separate it from the main land, until he could get vessels ready to accompany him, and he did accompany him.

And here let me pause to mark a point in English diplomatic artifice. Upon the arrival of Vancouver at Nootka sound, the island which forms the sound was called Quadra, and had been for years; the Spaniards were in possession; a Spanish commandant, he whose name the island bore, held possession in the name of Spain, and a flourishing Spanish settlement, with the consent and approbation of the natives, was established. Without a word on the subject of restoration, or of sovereignty, or right to the island, but silently and without the knowledge of any one, but doubtless with the secret sanction of the English ministry, Vancouver in his journal and chart christens the island by his own name, in order that England, half a century afterwards, might have another point on which to rest her random and vagrant claim. The flagrancy of this act is more striking when it is recollected that Spain held possession, not only at Nootka sound, but of the entire island of Vancouver—undisturbed, undisputed possession—from that period until the year 1795, when she voluntarily abandoned it, because the disturbed condition of Europe was such as to prevent her or any other European power from extending or protecting such remote settlements during the succeeding twenty years.

But did England after this abandonment by Spain come forward with her claim? Did she attempt a settlement? Certainly not. No senator can show, for England herself cannot, that between the parallels of 42° and 54° 40′ she ever made a settlement or asserted a "claim" to a single inch of ground, until it had been previously owned and occupied by others.

Notwithstanding her uniform course all over the world of claiming and holding by discovery as her own right, she requires something more in others, whenever it suits her purposes, than mere discovery.

Meares, who was the origin of this difficulty at Nootka sound, in a memorial made to his own government, but which is proved by substantial witnesses to be false, alleged that he had purchased land at Nootka of the native chief Maquinna, and had thus acquired the right to build, occupy, and possess.

Two American navigators, Captains Gray and Ingraham, were at that point when the difficulty occurred, and state emphatically that the chief denied ever giving the right to Meares or any other Englishman to make settlements there, nor did he to any extent admit their claims. On the contrary, at the period of this difficulty, the native chief took part with the Spaniards. This fact, even under the English construction of the rule for others in the consummation of title by discovery, gives Spain a perfect title; for when the act of discovery is accompanied by permanent settlement with the consent of the natives, it constitutes, according to that construction, a perfect title.

So much for the claim of England to Oregon; for this is the entire evidence of title upon which she rests. She is just where she was in 1789, when she attempted to extort the country from the weakness and the terrors of Spain. She has no additional derivation of title to point to from that hour to this. We have purchased the title of Spain by the Florida treaty; we acquired all her rights, and all her sovereignty. We stand to-day precisely in the shoes—if I may so speak—of Spain in 1789. We occupy in relation to Oregon the very position then occupied by that enfeebled and worn-out monarchy. Now, as then, the same domineering power is arming to the teeth to drive us completely from the ground which poor Spain more than half maintained.

Shall the mailed hand of England dictate to us another Nootka Sound convention? Shall it do more?—shall it force us to surrender that for which Spain prepared to struggle. Shall the twenty millions who now people free America, with energies unfathomed, and as I believe unfathomable, with resources unsurpassed in the history of nations—shall we, thus endowed, abandon a position in defence of which Spain was willing to hazard a contest, the result of which to her was not even doubtful, and upon it was staked her national existence? Even the effeminate mind of Charles IV held his nation's honor as dear as his nation's existence. I know it is sometimes sneeringly asked, what has honor to do with Oregon?—and why should there be so much talk about honor? Mr. Fox, whose authority I dearly love to quote—for I reverence his memory—said in the debate in Parliament I have before quoted from:

"Honor, to nations, was perhaps the only justifiable or rational ground of contest. Wars for the sake of conquest, of acquiring dominion or extending trade, were equally unjust and impolitic. He who vindicated the honor of a country was the advocate of its dearest interests, because to vindicate its honor was to secure its peace."

And this authority will stand good when the memory of those who ask "why talk of honor?" shall be forgotten.

But in addition to the title of Spain, we have one of our own to contend for—the discovery and entrance into the mouth of the Columbia river by Captain Gray, of Boston. That river has its source about the 53d parallel of north latitude. In addition to this, we have the right acquired by the discoveries and explorations of Lewis and Clarke, giving us higher than the 49th parallel, to which the senator from South Carolina would confine the American boundary. Is there nothing due to the enterprise, the privations, and the sufferings of that gallant party, despatched by our government to explore and take possession of this territory? Is there nothing due to the privations they endured in their journey to that region—piercing the mountains in a region of eternal snow—wintering without house, or tent, or hut, and subsisting on scanty meals of horse-flesh? Is there nothing due to the gallant efforts of these indomitable men in the service of their government?

Than the conjoint titles of Spain and the United States to Oregon, no better title exists by discovery, exploration, and infant occupation.

A single remark upon the expedition of Mackenzie, in consequence of which England, or some persons for her, pretend to found a claim north of the Columbia. He professed, and, indeed, he supposed, that he discovered the Columbia from near its source; but the fact, as long since established, proves that it was the Tacoutchee Tessee, which rises north of the Columbia, and which he pursued for some distance, and without ever having approached the Columbia from its source to its mouth.

A claim for England is also asserted by the discovery and pursuit of Frazer's river from near its source to its mouth. It will be remembered that this stream empties into the gulf of Georgia opposite Vancouver's island, which is separated at many points from the mainland by so short a space that, for a long time, it was regarded as a projection of the continent. The idle nature of such a claim must be apparent from the fact that the whole coast, at the point where Frazer's river discharges, is masked by Vancouver's island, more than two hundred and fifty miles long, and which had been, long prior to the exploration of Frazer, in the possession of Spain, as he was not in that region until several years after the Nootka Sound convention. Under these circumstances, to give the right of occupancy on the mainland to one power, where the right of sovereignty to the island was already in another, would be as preposterous as to divide Long Island from New York in the hands of different governments, the juxtaposition being as striking in the one case as in the other.

I have been charged with assailing the President. The last resolution of the senator from South Carolina conveys this imputation. I said I had no answer to make to that resolution, nor have I. But for the purpose of ascertaining who assails the President's position, and who sustains it, I will refer to his own message delivered at the opening of the present Congress. Surely he can better speak his own views, explain his own position, than the senator from South Carolina or myself. It will be observed that the resolutions of that distinguished senator fix the 49th parallel of north latitude as the limit of our possessions. Does the President do so? Let his message speak for him:

"When I came into office, I found this to be the state of the negotiation. Though entertaining the settled conviction, that the British pretensions of title could not be maintained to any portion of the Oregon territory upon any principle of public law recognised by nations, yet, in deference to what had been done by my predecessors, and especially in consideration that propositions of compromise had been thrice made," &c.

Again:

"The proposition thus offered and rejected repeated the offer of the parallel of forty-nine degrees of north latitude, which had been made by two preceding administrations, but without proposing to surrender to Great Britain, as they had done, the free navigation of the Columbia river. The right of any foreign power to the free navigation of any of our rivers, through the heart of our country, was one which I was unwilling to concede. It also embraced a provision to make free to Great Britain any port or ports on the cape of Quadra and Vancouver's island, south of this parallel. Had this been a new question, coming under discussion for the first time, this proposition would not have been made. The extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British government, and the rejection of the proposition made in deference alone to what had been done by my predecessors, and the implied obligation which their acts seemed to impose, afford satisfactory evidence that no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected. With this conviction, the proposition of compromise which had been made and rejected, was, by my direction, subsequently withdrawn, and our title to the whole Oregon territory asserted, and, as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments.

"The civilized world will see in these proceedings a spirit of liberal concession on the part of the United States; and this government will be relieved from all responsibility which may follow the failure to settle the controversy.

"All attempts at compromise having failed, it becomes the duty of Congress to consider what measures it may be proper to adopt for the security and protection of our citizens now inhabiting, or who may hereafter inhabit, Oregon, and for the maintenance of our just title to that territory. In adopting measures for this purpose, care should be taken that nothing be done to violate the stipulations of the convention of 1827, which is still in force."

Again:

"At the end of the year's notice, should Congress think it proper to make provision for giving that notice, we shall have reached a period when the national rights in Oregon must either be abandoned or firmly maintained. That they cannot be abandoned without a sacrifice of both national honor and interest, is too clear to admit of doubt.

"Oregon is a part of the North American continent, to which, it is confidently affirmed, the title of the United States is the best now in existence."

The proposition of compromise at the parallel of 49 degrees, he says distinctly, was by his order withdrawn, and our title to the whole territory asserted, immediately after the contemptuous rejection by the British minister of the offer of compromise.

And this fact and these opinions he communicates in his public message to all the world. It would seem an easy matter to determine which proposition, that of the senator from South Carolina, or the one which I submit, is in accordance with the views and intentions of the President as declared in his message. It is evident that the resolutions of that distinguished senator are intended for but one result. He goes for all the President has done that is in the grave, and against all his present and living action. He intends to drive the President from the unanswerable assertion of our title to 54° 40′, to bring him back to 49°, and to force him to the relinquishment of the whole of our territory above this line.

I said, sir—or if I did not, I say it now—that instead of meeting the question which is presented to the Senate by the resolutions which I had the honor to submit, the resolutions of the senator from South Carolina are directly an evasion of the question which is there presented. I present the whole question of title. The senator from South Carolina, instead of replying to that proposition, comes forward with some most ingeniously-drawn resolutions, neither asserting nor denying our title to one foot of the country, but insidiously draws attention from the main fact for the purpose of making an issue on what lawyers term an immaterial point.

I neglected speaking in reference to this point to allude to the language of one whose powerful intellect penetrates to the bottom of every question he investigates. I do not introduce it for the purpose of proving that which no man here will deny, but simply to show that long since in this chamber our situation on this question has been boldly and fearlessly defined. It is an extract from the speech of the great senator from the West, [Mr. Benton,] delivered here pending the Ashburton treaty—that treaty which surrendered at a summons our whole military frontier on the northeast. He fully maintains the view I have taken of our title to Oregon, and every inch of Oregon:

"The fate of Maine has doubled the dangers of the Columbia, and nearly placed us in a position to choose between WAR and INFAMY in relation to that river."

And, sir, just succeeding this, the senator from Missouri addresses the Senate in the following emphatic language:

"Nootka is in latitude 50—being four degrees north of the mouth of the Columbia, and to that degree did Spain assert and maintain her title against Great Britain in 1790. But that was not the extent of her assertion of that right. Against the British she asserted it to the whole extent of the coast; against the Russians, (the only real claimants, with ourselves, in that quarter,) to latitude 55. Thus, as deriving from Spain, our title is good against England throughout the coast; against Russia, to latitude 55. As deriving under discoveries and settlement, it is good against all the world, to the extent of the region drained by the waters of the Columbia river. We discovered the river from its mouth to its source, took possession of it as our territory, and, according to the laws of nations, have a clear and valid title to it."

Sir, I have been startled occasionally in this chamber by expressions which I have heard from estimable and distinguished members of this body in relation to the territory of Oregon. I heard a distinguished senator some few days since, (it may have been owing to the excitement of the moment in the warmth of debate, but its effect upon the country will be the same,)—I heard a distinguished senator speak sneeringly of a contest for what he was pleased to call the possession of a piece of land at the end of the earth. Does that senator know the value, the position, the soil, the power of this piece of land at the end of the earth? Sir, if we can credit the statements of those who have visited it, there is no finer region of the earth on any portion of its surface: there is to be found within its limits every inducement which can be held out to enterprising man. We have the highest authority for the fact that on the island of Vancouver in the month of April the grass was already a foot high, the temperature so delightful that in all that month the mercury, according to Fahrenheit, never sunk below 48, rising during the day to from 65 to 70. It is a well-known fact that the western slope of both Europe and America possesses a far milder temperature than their eastern slopes. The western coast of America has the advantage by some five degrees over the western coast of Europe. The highest point of Vancouver's island does not extend as far north as Dublin and Liverpool, with the additional advantage of this milder climate under the same parallel of latitude.

The Pacific coast of America is milder than the Atlantic coast by some twelve or fifteen degrees. And it is in this region, between the parallels of 49° and 64°, that exist, as on both faces of the Atlantic, in natural combination, the harbors with depth of water and convenient shores for marine arsenals and depots; the timber for marine construction; the fisheries to create and nurse a maritime population; the high tides of a northern latitude for docks. But all these are enhanced above anything on the Atlantic by the high temperature of the winter climate; the generous tranquillity of the Pacific waters, the great size, the grand features, and the sublime scenery which are there blended in harmonious unison with the grand ocean on which they look out. God and nature point to Oregon as the main column of this mighty empire.

Mr. Mangum here desired to set Mr. Hannegan right, if his allusion, as he supposed, was intended for him.

Mr. Hannegan having replied that his allusion was to his remarks a few days since—

Mr. Mangum said, I have taken occasion to express no opinion on the question in relation to what might or might not be the value of that country. In truth, the opinions upon the subject are so conflicting that I have not been able to form a satisfactory one. Some have represented it as a steril country, without water and rain. Others again, among whom is a friend of mine, a member of the other House from Ohio, say it is adapted to the production of sugar and cotton, even as far up as the 61st degree.

Mr. Hannegan. If it was adapted to the production of sugar and cotton, it would not have encountered the opposition it has met here; its possession would at once have been secured, for that very opposition would have composed its warmest support. Sir, it is not good for the production of sugar and cotton, nor is it destitute of rain; for if the honorable senator will examine the account of Lewis and Clarke, he will find, that during the winter months they were nearly drowned out.

It is good for something better than sugar and cotton; for Nootka sound commands the north Pacific ocean, and will, in less than half a century, become the grand emporium for the commerce of the Oriental world. A compromise upon the 49th parallel is continually urged upon us. As I live, and as I shall answer to my constituents, I would rather give away every foot of it. The island of Vancouver is the power of Oregon, and four-fifths of it, including Nootka sound, lies above the parallel of 49°. Let England possess Nootka sound, the finest harbor in the world, commanding as it does the straits of Fuca, and consequently the access to Puget's sound, and she has all of Oregon worth possessing in a commercial and maritime point of view. She would hold the straits of Fuca and Puget's sound as securely as the trap holds the mouse; for by this compromise, she also secures the gulf of Georgia and Queen Charlotte sound. If we surrender above 49°, we give away every harbor worth having on the coast. There is no harbor below that would give shelter to a fleet of canoes.

But, with the permission of the Senate, I will read a short extract from the speech I have before alluded to, of the distinguished senator from Missouri, describing Oregon as it is. And a more bold and graphic description was never uttered in this chamber. Here it is:

"I do not dilate upon the value and extent of this great country. A word suffices to display both. In extent it is larger than the Atlantic portion of the old thirteen United States; in climate, softer; in fertility, greater; in salubrity, superior; in position, better, because fronting Asia, and washed by a tranquil sea. In all these particulars, the western slope of our continent is far more happy than the eastern. In configuration, it is inexpressibly fine and grand—a vast oblong square, with natural boundaries, and a single gateway into the sea. The snow-capped Rocky mountains enclose it to the east, an iron-bound coast on the west, a frozen desert on the north, and sandy plains on the south. All its rivers, rising on the segment of a vast circumference, run to meet each other in the centre, and then flow together into the ocean through a gap in the mountain, where the heats of summer and the colds of winter are never felt, and where southern and northern diseases are equally unknown. This is the valley of the Columbia—a country whose every advantage is crowned by the advantages of position and configuration: by the unity of all its parts—the inaccessibility of its borders, and its single introgression to the sea. Such a country is formed for union, wealth, and strength. It can have but one capital, and that will be a Thebes; but one commercial emporium, and that will be Tyre, queen of cities. Such a country can have but one people, one interest, one government; and that people should be American, that interest ours, and that government republican. Accursed and infamous be the man that divides or alienates it!"

This is the language of the senator from Missouri a few years since, and to every word of it I utter a hearty amen.

Mr. President, the spirit of resistance to progress, which we witness here now, is as ancient as our country is old. It has been seen at an early day in opposition to the settlement of Kentucky, struggling to confine our republic without the Alleghanies; in vehement opposition to the purchase of Louisiana and Florida; in uncharitable efforts to repel Texas. But this last fury against Oregon is an infanticide more unjustifiable and fiendish than all its predecessors, for it feloniously invokes the Hessian power of British tyranny to block our path, and hurl us from the trail of our destiny. It will prove the work of Sysiphus.

There were some positions taken by the distinguished senator from Delaware, [Mr. Clayton,] in which I find it impossible to concur. He suggested to the Senate that the question of our title to Oregon ought not to be made the subject of discussion in open Senate; and indicated the propriety of withholding the expression of our opinions on a matter which might hereafter come before us connected with a treaty—to withhold all discussion until these galleries shall be cleared, and these doors closed. In this sentiment I cannot concur. I hold that the Oregon question has become the property of the American people. It is in every man's mouth, and but one question is asked everywhere in relation to it—"Is Oregon our own?" If it is, then it becomes us in open Senate to vindicate our right to it. There is no cause which can more certainly and fatally impair our institutions, none that will more speedily insure their overthrow, none that will so assuredly produce anarchy, as the conviction in the hearts of the people that their public authorities and their representatives want alike the energy and the spirit to assert and to defend the rights and the honor of the nation. It is the opinion of six-sevenths of the American people that Oregon is ours—perhaps I should rather say five-sevenths, for I must leave out of the estimate the commercial and stock-jobbing population of our great cities along the seaboard, a great portion of whom are English subjects, residing among us for the purpose of traffic, and many others not now and not intending to become American citizens; and they hold that if the territory is ours, we should assert our title to it and take it. If there ever was a question on earth which demanded discussion before the great tribunal of the public, it is the question of title to Oregon. More than all others, it interests the people of this country at this hour; and more than all others they have the right to know each and every step taken by their government and their representatives. Let the title to Oregon be argued here in the glare of day, before the bar of the American people. Smother it not, smother it not. The hour will be melancholy in our history when a question like this, upon which the people have passed in judgment, shall be withdrawn from public view for a decision in secret and in darkness. I should fear it as the brief prelude to the entrance of some Caius Gracchus in this consecrated chamber, whose heart, big with the fires of freedom, and roused by a sense of public wrong, should impel him to trample upon the cherished forms, and the solemnity of this body; by a simple change of attitude, turning from the Comitium and that venerated chair, to address the great Forum without.

In such a stake as this the people demand a hearing. If it is ours, shall we fear to avow it? If it is England's, we want it not. Here, here, and now, is the place and the hour to discuss the title, that our country may know, if a treaty should come, whether her servants have sustained her interests and her honor, or abandoned them.

There was another point in the remarks of the honorable and distinguished senator, in which I could not concur. I unite heartily with that senator in the desire to put the country in a more efficient posture of defence. In all the conversations we have had together on that subject, our views and sentiments entirely agree. But I must utterly object to having the power of England held up in this body, with a view to act upon the nerves of the American people.

The honorable senator has arrayed before us the mighty naval power of England, the number of her ships of war, her sailors, and her guns, and the comparatively diminutive force we present. I think a close scrutiny would lessen the exhibit of her available force, and increase that of ours; but that is not to my purpose at present. If that senator by this intended to awe us into a compromise by the surrender of our territory, it was certainly both ill-timed and ill-planned; that would better have become a secret session. The idea of surrendering without an effort, because of the numerical superiority of the enemy, whether in guns or men, is new to me in military history. I admit that it is right and proper to examine the force of Great Britain, but at the same time we ought not to forget or undervalue our own. The American people cannot be alarmed; they are not to be awed by any such representations.

Were all the fleets of England gathered in one body, their approach would create no terror in the American heart. Our people remember that more than sixty years ago, one small American frigate, commanded by John Paul Jones, made its way through her navies, to ravage England's coasts and pillage her palaces, and returned in triumph. They have not forgotten the names of Decatur, Hull, Perry, Porter, the Joneses, McDonough, Stewart, and a glorious host beside, who united to indomitable courage and lofty heroism a burning love for their country and its free and happy institutions. Though England's guns were a hundred to one, the heart of the nation would not tremble, while her eye was on the roll of these bright and undying names, and her memory full of their deeds of noble daring.

The honorable senator quoted to us the words of England's model monarch when he was deliberating the invasion of France. It is plain the senator has not learned his rules of war from Harry the Fifth. The senator did not quote far enough. For, as the great dramatist tells us, when the king was assured by the archbishop, on whose learning he so greatly relied, that his title to France was valid, that it was, in a word, "clear and unquestionable," what did he do? Did he hesitate? Did he pause and inquire, "But where are my troops?—and where are my ships?—and how many guns do they carry?—are they in number equal to the enemy?" Not at all. Relying on the courage of his soldiers, and the support of God to the justice of his cause, he gave orders at once to march, and, on the field of Agincourt—the most glorious field England ever saw—he met his enemies without dismay, though more than ten to one against him, and from his brave and confident heart, cried aloud that he could almost wish the number of his little band still less. With that handful of invincible soldiers he vanquished France and all her multitude, and won for himself and them a renown lasting as the foundations of the world.

The senator did not learn his art of war from the greatest of the Romans—the immortal Julius. Had "the foremost man in all the world" acted on the cautious policy of the honorable gentleman from Delaware, he would have left the triumph of Pharsalia to the glory of Pompey, whose numbers were double his own. Nor did he learn in the school of the great Frederick, nor of Gustavus Adolphus, nor of our own Washington and Jackson. No, sir; the senator learnt from none of these the rules of contest in a struggle for the right.

In looking at the course of the distinguished senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Calhoun,] I find that, three years ago last month, that able and distinguished gentleman opposed, in this chamber, a bill which proposed to take possession of Oregon, to the same extent and no further than England had already done; and his opposition was based on the expense of the measures proposed. The estimates for carrying those measures into effect did not exceed $100,000; and the utmost amount they would have cost could not have exceeded $200,000. And on that occasion, when speaking against the bill for military posts and occupation, he suggested the notice (which he now opposes) as a necessary preliminary measure to all other action. Three years ago, he opposed the measures because they were premature, and now he opposes the notice which was then the essential preliminary. He then contended that the notice to Great Britain of the termination of the convention should precede the extension of our laws to Oregon; yet now, when that very thing is proposed, that senator vehemently opposes it. I cannot, I acknowledge, comprehend what are his intentions, unless they arise from an uncompromising and deadly hostility to the acquisition of any territory in Oregon beyond what we now hold by actual settlement, and even that, perhaps, he regards as a proper subject of compromise. On that occasion the honorable senator, with the ability which characterizes all his efforts, presented to the Senate a comprehensive and graphic view of the then state of the finances and the country. He truly represented the country as being on the road to ruin, embarrassed at every point, and sinking deeper and deeper at every step. The great cause of our then depressed condition was represented by the senator to be an oppressive system of taxation.

I am as strongly in favor of a revenue tariff as the senator from South Carolina. But I cannot resist the conclusion that, as his prediction of the result has failed, so his assignment of causes was imperfect. He predicted that the government would founder; that event has not occurred, and so far from it, we are this day in a condition of as high prosperity as the world has ever witnessed.

During the past season, the farmer, the planter, and the artisan, have all received a rich reward for toil and industry; we have an overflowing treasury; and that too at a period when no false causes exist to produce the deceptive appearance of unreal wealth. Sir, the unhappy condition of our finances three years since can only, and justly be attributed to causes which run back as far as 1836, and to a great extent were continued during the two following years. The general prostration from which we had not recovered in 1843, was the result of that worthless and bloated paper currency, the creation of those deadly foes to free institutions, heartless, irresponsible, unprincipled corporations, with which the country was studded from one end to the other. A renewal of the paper system of currency, under any mode or principle of taxation, will forever be attended with the same disastrous results, which have already twice marked the history of our country.

If it was proper three years since to commence with the notice, as a necessary preliminary to all measures for taking possession of Oregon, why is it not so now?

But the senator from South Carolina is wedded to a different plan—a plan which avoids all action. He is for leaving the whole matter to the silent, quiet, noiseless operation of time, and the gradual encroachments of our hardy and enterprising settlers who have gone, and are going, into the territory. Does not every one know that all the while they are making these very noiseless and quiet encroachments, they are exposed to the British bayonet? And whilst so exposed you refuse them the protection of American laws, and American tribunals. Such a state of things would inevitably produce repetitions of the Caroline affair.

But do gentlemen flatter themselves that we can thus take Oregon and England know nothing of it? Will they not understand this policy as well as we? And when they perceive the plan likely to take effect, will they not be on their guard? If we press our population upon them, will they not, in turn, press their pauper population upon us? Which of the two plans will most consult the honor of this country? Which story shall we rather leave on record as a heritage to our posterity—the plan of the honorable senator, to get the territory by silent encroachment, or that advocated by gentlemen on the other side, who are for demanding the territory because it is ours? Shall we take it openly and boldly by a straightforward manly course?—or shall we get it covertly, slily, stealthily? No, I will not say stealthily; I will not employ any term that may imply the slightest disrespect to the honorable senator; I will not say stealthily, but I will say circuitously; yes, that is the word—circuitously. I would not say anything that could be a cause of offence to the honorable gentleman from South Carolina. I have no such feeling toward him. I hold that honorable senator in too much respect; I have too much esteem and regard for him. I would not for the world pluck one leaf from the laurel that enwreathes his venerated brow. He has ably served his country in many and various important stations; I hope and trust he will do nothing that shall mar the page in this nation's history which he is destined to fill. I respect his acquisitions; above all, I venerate his virtues—the spotless purity of his private life. It is on these that the future American Plutarch will most delight to dwell. But the senator's course is circuitous—ours is direct. Which, I ask, will do most honor to a country like this? Which will read the best? Sir, how will it read along side of the history of '76? Then the whole population of a range of Atlantic colonies, sooner than submit to the exaction of a slight tax, took up arms and went into the appeal of battle. They stood for their rights in many a bloody field, and they conquered those rights from the mightiest and the haughtiest power the world ever saw. Such was the first chapter of our history, read and studied by the nations of the Old World. But what is to be the second chapter? At first we had but three millions of people; now we have twenty millions. Our wealth, our power, our energy have increased in more than a like proportion. And now the same old enemy claims a great empire on our western coast, and the descendants of that same people resolve, sooner than resist, to surrender their rights, and let her take it. I trust no such chapter is to be written in our history.

And now a word or two on the proposition for arbitration. We learn from the complexion of a great portion of the press, the prompt rejection of the offer of arbitration by our government meets the most decided disapprobation in certain quarters. Coming from the quarter it does, this condemnation by the press, so far from weakening, gives strength to the administration. It is the best proof of its merits. Arbitration? Arbitrate what? Arbitrate a question which admits of no debate, as was done in the case of Maine? Submit our rights to the decision of a crowned head, who, when the treaty was submitted to him, spoke of a boundary line which ran from the northwest branch of a certain river, took the northeastern branch of it! If a man should claim the farm for which I hold a government patent, and because my neighbor, who set up the claim, happened to be a very rich man, and very influential in the neighborhood—a man who was always fomenting quarrels among his neighbors—threatens to seize my property, must I consent to submit my title to arbitration by strangers, and with no assurance that the money of my adversary may not corrupt, or, at least, prejudice the minds of the arbitrators? If a man claims a house and lot, and goes to law to support his title, will he submit his right to arbitration? No; he will say, let the law take its course. Just so ought we to do in this question of our title to Oregon.

There is another point which I cannot omit to touch upon; and that is, the contrast in the course of the honorable senator on this subject of Oregon and that of the annexation of Texas. That honorable gentleman now stands before the country in a very prominent attitude as the advocate of peace. Peace is all his cry; an honorable adjustment of this question so as to preserve peace. But how was it when Texas stood before us asking to be annexed to this republic? At that time the senator did not hold peace to be quite so valuable. I allude, especially, to his letter addressed to Mr. King, at Paris; a letter whose language could not but be to the last degree offensive to the British government; so much so, that if we should get into a war now, I should not be surprised if, after all, that letter was at the bottom of it. The senator then planted himself on the highest ground. He openly defied England on that question of annexation. But what is his tone now? He is willing now to buy England off with five and a half degrees of Oregon.

Upon the question involved in my second resolution, that there is no power in this government to alienate the soil, and transfer the allegiance of its citizens to any foreign power whatever.

The senator from South Carolina assumes, in opposition to this principle, that the treaty-making power can exercise it under the pretext of settling boundaries. Treaties can only be made by, or through, the instrumentality of the sovereign power. Where that power is undelegated by the people, or any portion of them, it is unlimited, as in Russia and Turkey. In constitutional monarchies, such as England and France, it is more circumscribed; but where the limit to the treaty-making power begins or ends with them, I never have been able to discover. In the mixed form of the English government, where the aristocratical and the monarchical principle alternately prevails, there are certain checks, to be sure; but they are essentially of the one upon the other, and mainly discretionary in the crown. There is scarcely a power, no matter how arbitrary, the exercise of which by the British crown cannot be justified, at least by analogy, if not by precedent, under the British constitution, whenever the occasion authorizes the use of the word necessity—necessity.

But fortunately for us, happily for mankind, a different state of things exists here; and consequently we cannot be pointed to their practice for precedents in our conduct. Ours is a limited government, a government of delegated powers, every one of which is plainly expressed; nothing is left to implication. There is no avenue here for the silent march of usurpation, under the plea—alike the plea of the tyrant and the demagogue—*expediency*.

The limit of the treaty-making power is confined, equally with the legislative and judicial powers. They can none of them transcend the express creations of the constitution itself. And the ascertainment of the extent of each and every power, of the true intent of every article, is governed and controlled by the same rule of construction which prevails with all other laws; and that rule is a reference to the context for the spirit and meaning of the whole instrument.

Happily the spirit and meaning of the constitution of the United States is plainly and explicitly declared by a portion of the context:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."—*Article* 10, *Amendments Con. U. S.*

Such is the plain, and not to be misapprehended language of the 10th article of the amendments to the constitution. This comprehensive article declares the spirit and the meaning, and fixes impassable boundaries to the limits of the whole instrument, and of all the powers of the federal government created and existing under its agency.

And now comes my second resolution:

Resolved, That there exists no power in this government to transfer its soil, and the allegiance of its citizens, to the dominion, authority, control, and subjection, of any foreign power, prince, state, or sovereignty.

Unless the language of this resolution is true, ours is no longer a government of limited powers, or rather it never has been such.

If it is not true, in the creation of the treaty-making power, there was planted a mystic and implied power, beyond the plain meaning, the apparent spirit, and the common understanding of the instrument.

The reverse of the principle contained in this resolution, asserts for the President and Senate discretionary powers, to which there are no bounds. If the President and Senate can alienate the soil of the republic, and transfer the allegiance of its citizens, what further step is necessary to the creation of a despotism? I know of none; for they involve the very highest prerogatives of unlimited monarchy.

This is not a question of boundaries. No such question is raised by my resolutions. And the counter resolutions of the senator from South Carolina are but an evasion of the real issue. We show a title to Oregon; England shows none—assumes none. To surrender a portion of our soil on such a pretext, is to conceal the real motive of action, which is, that England is powerful, and we are weak. In plain words, the motive must be dread of England.

Sir, the doctrines to which I have just adverted open a range which no eye at present can begin to compass. If we adopt for our guide the practice of other countries in making treaties, if we allow this undefined range to the treaty-making power at this point, must we not at once admit its supremacy elsewhere? If they possess this the highest attribute of earthly power, where is the restriction upon their control over the whole revenue system of the country by commercial treaties, fixing the rate of importation duties? It is in vain to say that the constitution gives to "*Congress*" the right to "*lay and collect duties, imposts,*" &c., and that all "bills for revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." The same instrument expressly reserves to "*Congress*" "*the right to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States,*" &c. The term "dispose" here, it can be easily shown, does not imply the power to alienate, but it is not necessary for my present purpose, should it even be contended to the contrary, as I merely wish to show that "*Congress*," and not the President and Senate, is the constituted guardian of the territories of the United States.

If the power now claimed for the President and Senate is admitted, you can at "one fell swoop" expatriate Iowa and Wisconsin, should England claim them. Upon the same principle, the treaty-making power can surrender this District, should England stir up some antiquated claim. I say upon the same principle, for principles are in themselves fixed and immovable, and cannot be changed to suit ever-shifting opinions. Our title to Oregon is sustained by the concurrence of history and of evidence, and if we now surrender it north of the parallel of 49°, it is the relinquishment of a clear and established right to a territory large enough for an empire. And this relinquishment is urged upon us for the sake of peace.

Mr. President, war is to be deplored; it is a great calamity; but the warnings of history are false, its many memorials but idle tales, if there is not a far greater calamity for nations—a purchased and disgraceful peace. Bloated and enervated China is a living witness of the fact. Modern Italy still groans under the curse inflicted upon her centuries ago by a feeble empire, whose tyranny she might have resisted, but did not. To this hour the ignoble descendants of the most heroic race the ancient world ever saw, exhibit the degrading effects of cringing submission. Alas! alas! for the endless train of woes which awaits the nation won from the assertion of her rights by the allurements of luxury and peace.

Upon the other hand, consecrated Marathon, through the lapse of twenty-five centuries, still bears fresh witness to the glory of the heroic Greeks, who disdained a purchased peace. Bunker Hill, Trenton, and Yorktown, are monuments on the page of history, and on our own sacred soil of the same noble resolution. And this whole land, the youngest and fairest daughter of earth, the favored of God, is the enduring and eternal monument of those who preferred resistance to submission, and all the perils of a most unequal and deadly strife, to the debasing pleasures of a purchased, and therefore an ignominious peace.

But you must let us alone with our traffic! Stir not, or our commerce is ruined! You had better surrender Oregon than disturb our traffic!

Such is this day the language of the descendants of those who made that glorious choice. Let us traffic! Traffic on, I say, but do not barter away your country's territory, and her last, her priceless jewel—her honor. Do not traffic, as did the base Judean, who, for thirty pieces, sold "*a pearl richer than all his tribe.*" Traffic on; but, for the love of Heaven, do not traffic in the allegiance of freemen and the freedom of your fellow-citizens.

It was the splendid language of a famous Englishman—"*I regard the legal liberty of the meanest man in Britain as much as my own, and I would defend it with the same zeal.*"

This noble sentiment should of itself preserve the writings of its author to all posterity. But if it be good in an Englishman, how much dearer should its application be to every American. Yet what American can utter it who would be willing to transfer his fellow-citizens to the bondage of a monarch's rule? I cherish this lofty sentiment of the patriotic Englishman, and I cherish it the more as I contemplate its comprehensiveness. Is it regard for the legal liberty of the American citizen to transfer him and his to the dominion and control of the English monarchy? Where is your warrant for ceding away five degrees and a half of Oregon? Where is your warrant for withdrawing the ægis of your constitution and laws from any, even the meanest of your citizens, who may have fixed his habitation on the most remote and steril point in all your dominions? Is the senator from S. Carolina prepared and willing to transfer any, even though it be the poor pioneer, whose sinewy form first parts the tangled forest to let in upon the eternal solitudes the light of day; from whose rude hut the first smoke of the pale face curls in the wilderness? Shall freedom's sabbath be no more for him? Far, far away, and lonely as he is, he has his domestic altar, and before it God and freedom are worshipped together. He has his household gods—the names his mother taught him, perhaps in South Carolina, perhaps in Massachusetts, when he, a fair-haired boy, played by her side. He has taught in turn, and he hears them daily from lisping childhood, and first of these is Washington. Where is the steel-clad hand, where the iron heart, that would break down this altar, desecrate this worship, and change upon his children's lips the name of Washington for England's Queen? Rather, were that hut mine, should its fire go out forever—rather, far rather, should the serpent wind its devious way among the lifeless bodies of the best loved of my heart, to coil and hiss unharmed upon the hearthstone.

But I have no fears for Oregon, none, if the voice of the American people can be heard. I would be willing this hour to lay aside all further question here, and let the matter go again to them. I say again, for they have already made one decision in favor of the whole territory. The appeal was made by the Baltimore convention to the nation for the whole of Oregon, which was answered by the election of James K. Polk and George M Dallas. Submit to the people again the question of "Oregon or no Oregon?" "49° or 54° 40′?" If three-fifths do not respond "54° 40′," "the whole of Oregon," I never would utter the word again. My fear is not of the people. My fear is lest this question should be strangled here. When the doors are closed, and there is no eye to see what we do, I fear it may meet the fate "of Richard's nephews in the tower." Everywhere the same mighty considerations must prevail, when the question is known and understood. In the West we utterly forbid the unholy sacrifice—no compromise by the surrender of one single foot.

But it is not the West alone that forbids it. History, speaking from the sepulchre of the sainted dead, forbid it. The shades of Washington, of Adams, of Henry, of the whole host of revolutionary sires, forbid it. A still small voice from Lexington and