

The North Carolina Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1846.

VOLUME XII.—NUMBER 596.
TERMS—\$5 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS.
THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.
Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.
For four copies, \$10 00
" ten " 20 00
" twenty " 35 00
The same rate for six months.
Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers with the cash (\$15) will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.
Advertisements not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted one time for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion—those of great length, in proportion. Court Orders and Judgments, when charged twenty-five per cent higher than the above rates. A deduction of 33 1-3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year. (If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.)

SPEECH OF MR. HAYWOOD, OF NORTH CAROLINA.

In the Senate, on the 4th and 5th March, 1846,
On the Joint Resolution for giving the notice to terminate the convention between the U. States and Great Britain relative to the Oregon Territory.

(CONCLUDED.)

But, Mr. President, there are some other topics that have been introduced into this discussion, which I feel obliged to notice. We have been told that the PEOPLE have decided this question, and all Democrats are called to obey the voice of the people at the peril of consequences. I am a Democrat, and upon party questions I am a party man. Of this, I make no concealment; and at home I have never been suspected, I think, but once, and that did not last long. But I am not a slave to dictation, nor a tame follower of any man's lead, especially upon questions likely to involve my party in danger, or my country in ruin. I am Democrat enough not to shrink from speaking the truth boldly to the people, as they shall hear who hear me at all. I had rather serve them than please them, though I have found in my own experience that honest service is the best avenue to their confidence. I do not know nor believe that the people are opposed to an honorable compromise of this controversy. That they might be made so by wilful appliances, I have no doubt. But I do not shrink from meeting such an issue directly—and then led by demagogues, who called them together. Oh, my country!—my country! I wish that shall be our fate, if, in the providence of God, it shall ever be!

Sir, hear what the Father of his Country said, a half a century ago. Let the People hear him. Let an American Senate hear him. Let PRESIDENT POLK hear PRESIDENT WASHINGTON, and stand by his position! How precious will be his reward!

"There had been a public meeting in Philadelphia for the purpose of passing resolves against Jay's treaty. After the business of the meeting was closed, a copy of the treaty was suspended on a pole and carried about the streets by a company of people, who at length stopped in front of the British Minister's house, and there burnt the treaty; and also before the door of the British Consul, amidst the huzzas and acclamations of the multitude!" In Boston the same sort of thing was done, and a town meeting addressed to the President a protest. This was his reply to all:

"To Ezekiel Price, Thomas Wallis, William Boardman, Ebenezer Seaver, Thomas Crafts, Thomas Edwards, William Little, William Scollay, and Jesse Putnam—Selectmen of the town of Boston.

"GENTLEMEN: In every act of my administration, I have sought the happiness of my fellow-citizens. My system for the attainment of this object has uniformly been to overlook all personal, local, and partial considerations; to contemplate the United States as one great whole; to confide that sudden impressions, when erroneous, would yield to candid reflection; and to consult only the substantial and permanent interests of our country.

"Nor have I departed from this line of conduct on the occasion which has produced the resolutions contained in your letter of the 13th instant. Without a predilection for my own judgment, I have weighed with attention every argument which has at any time been brought into view. But the CONSTITUTION is the guide, which I never can abandon. It has assigned to the PRESIDENT the power of making treaties, with the advice and consent of the SENATE. It was doubtless supposed that these two branches of Government would combine, without passion, and with the best means of information, those facts and principles upon which the success of our foreign relations will always depend; that they ought not to substitute for their own conviction the opinions of others or to seek truth through any channel but that of a temperate and well-informed investigation.

"Under this persuasion, I have resolved on the manner of executing the duty before me. To the high responsibility attached to it, I freely submit; and you, gentlemen, are at liberty to make these sentiments known as the grounds of my procedure. While I feel the most lively gratitude for the many instances of approbation from my country, I can no otherwise DESERVE it than by obeying the dictates of my CONSCIENCE.

"With due respect, I am, gentlemen, &c.,
"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

Who does not know the history of that party denunciation and violence which disturbed this nation even under Washington's Administration,

when GENET appealed to the PEOPLE of the States in behalf of France and against Great Britain, and how PRESIDENT WASHINGTON'S celebrated Proclamation of Neutrality saved the PEACE OF AMERICA. In taking leave of the duties and cares of public station, hear what WASHINGTON said of it to the people:

"After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound to take, an interest to take a NEUTRAL position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness."

And, oh, how like a patriot and father, did he, still yearning over his country, warn us by his FAREWELL ADDRESS to beware of all self-constituted combinations to overawe and control this Senate! It is Washington who speaks to us from the grave; let Senators listen!

"The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of Government. But the constitutions which at any time exist, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

"All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, interfere with, or oppose the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party—often a small and artful majority, to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans, digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

"However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are, in the course of time, and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the PEOPLE, to usurp for themselves the reins of Government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion." Farewell Address.

What words of wisdom and of truth are these! They are the principles of liberty, well-regulated liberty; of freedom, constitutional freedom.

Methinks I see the coming storm. The press may be already charged; but no matter. This is my country's question, not a mere party strife. These are the sentiments my head and my heart approve, and I will not withhold them. The President may peril his Administration—some of you believe he will—if he or his friends should dare to think like WASHINGTON—to act like WASHINGTON. But he will violate his duty and peril his country if he does not. So did WASHINGTON peril his Administration; but, the people, the DEMOCRACY, came to the rescue, and all was well. A much humbler victim (like him who addresses you) must expect to be marked as a disturber of our party harmony. But shall I preach harmony when there is no concord, upon such questions as these? It would be political hypocrisy. I read in an American Constitution the lessons which Washington taught, and upon which Washington ACTED; and if "that be treason, make the most of it," the PEOPLE shall hear. Are not these the true principles of this Government, from WASHINGTON down to FEDERAL and DEMOCRATIC—have ACTED—have ACTED—have ACTED! I say—in the management of our foreign affairs? I challenge a reputation by their acts—not mere words. It is southern Democracy, Mr. President, beyond all dispute. It is that sort which I have always professed; not like a potato, that grows under ground at the root; but which blooms and bears its fruit in the open air of heaven, and then ripens and is FIT FOR USE.

I say nothing about LEGISLATIVE INSTRUCTIONS—not a word. I have not time to speak upon that point, so as to express myself in a manner to avoid misrepresentations; and it is not necessary I should raise that question before I shall be instructed. Suffice it to say, that NORTH CAROLINA has not instructed her Senators. I esteem it a jewel in the crown of my State, that North Carolina never did, in any party mutations or political excitements, instruct her Senators upon a TREATY OF TRADES, WAR, or so far as I know, I presume it will not so much as be pretended that I sought to pay obedience to the mandates of any other State.

[At this stage of his remarks, Mr. HAYWOOD gave an amusing account of the game of politics to be played with this OREGON question in President-making. The substance was, that the great Western Democratic statesman, (Mr. Benton)—[he had seen ever since last summer.]—was to be drummed out of the party, with the false label upon his back, of "traitor to Oregon!" The great Southern Democratic statesman, [Mr. Calhoun] was to be dismissed, falsely labelled with the cry of "Panic faith to Oregon!" The Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. Sevier] another eloquent and early friend of Oregon, would find himself marched out for his want of foresight—because, in the last Congress, he made a speech for the notice, but instead of going for "all or none," "fight or no fight," he had got for his reward a vulgar patch to his back, of "notice for the sake of negotiation." The Secretary of State, [Mr. Buchanan], and all the Cabinet, would probably be dismissed, in a body, from the party, branded as "British compromisers." And as that left the Governor of New York still in the party, Mr. H. asked, "what of him?" How is he to be got rid of?" "Oh, that will be a small job, provided the indignation against the WASHINGTON TREATY can be kept up to a white heat long enough, as he voted for its ratification." [Then turning to Mr. Webster]—"The Senator from Massachusetts may see a more amiable excuse for certain state strictures upon the 'Washington treaty' than make towards the negotiator. GOVERNOR WRIGHT, as a Senator, voted for its ratification; and he happens not to be here to vote upon the Oregon. So 'Ratification of the Ashburton treaty' will be his badge upon his dismissal. During that part of the speech there was much laughter, and the picture, although drawn seriously, was exhibited in good humor. He then proceeded as follows:]

Why, in the name of all that is safe to my party, where do the Democrats expect to find a Presidential candidate? Who will be our President after we have expelled all our biggest men? Sir, I am sure I do not know.

[Mr. HANNEGAN remarked: "Take him from amongst the people, where we get our best men."]

Oh! Ay, then he is to be taken from among the people, is he—without resorting to such statesmen as those I have named? We shall see how ever, whether the people agree to have this game played after a three year's notice.

There is a mistake, however, Mr. President, in what the Senator from Indiana exclaimed, at his first sight of my imperfect picture. In my State, let me tell that Senator, when Democrats talk of "the people," we mean "the masses"—the "bone and sinew" of the land, as distinguished from the statesmen, lawyers, politicians, and such like. In that sense, I deny that President Polk was got for a candidate from among "the people." He has been a politician all his life, and we knew it when he was nominated. Thank God for it!—he has now proved himself to have been more—one of the STATESMEN of this great country. And if he will still stand up by the side of Washington, as he has done, and I hope he will do, he will be entitled to our lasting admiration. That sort of flattery to the people would not take at all with "the people" in my part of the world, and I should be sorry to think it would tickle the people very much anywhere. A man is no worse, as a man, because he does not possess the learning and political experience which are requisite to fit him for the position of Chief Magistrate of the United States. Nobody pretends to that. But it is a great evil when everybody thinks he is fit to be the President; and my friend from Indiana should stand up before a crowd of honest Democrats in my State and talk to "the people," the "real people," the "masses," there—the men who drive their own ploughs, make their own carts, &c., and quietly pursue their occupation at home—about NOMINATING ONE OF THEM FOR PRESIDENT, they would do what I will not—laugh in his face, and tell him that he might as well talk of getting a blacksmith to mend watches.

But let me ask the attention of Senators whilst I give to the Baltimore resolution a more partial notice. It has been often referred to in the Senate, and no one has answered. I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Breese] is entitled to the distinction of having first read it in Senate. He did not have the Secretary to read it, but read it himself: Next year for the next step! The Senate, having no wish to misrepresent me, need not be asked to remember that I shall have nothing to say against the convention or its members. The resolution which has been gravely read, and often relied upon as deserving great weight and consideration in our deliberations, is my subject; not the convention. The resolution on Oregon is simply this: The declaration of opinions by a party convention recommending opinions to the people which were unanimously adopted by the convention. That is its precise character. They are before me.

"Resolved, That our title to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other Power; and that the re-occupation of Oregon, and the re-annexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democratic party of this Union."

It is remarkable how this resolution has acquired so much importance now, when it was not even thought worthy of being communicated to Mr. Polk at that time by its authors. I have before me, in Niles's Register, the letter informing him of his nomination, and expecting to elect him; and his reply accepts the nomination, hoping they may. That is about the whole of it. In good taste, and enough said. If any Senator wishes it, I will read the letters. Here they are. But not a word about Oregon—not a syllable. No pledges made, and none required. In truth, we all know that the Baltimore Convention was not called to instruct or to express opinions for the party, but simply to choose a DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE. So you come round again to Mr. Polk's nomination for President, and which has not changed to this day. Of that I have already spoken.

Then whom does this resolution bind? Why brought into this Senate? But before you answer me, recollect there were two Baltimore Conventions. [Some person said—"three."] I know, but I don't count the Tyler Convention. [A good deal of laughter took place at this remark, and Mr. H. said, "I mean no sneer—no offence to any one."] The Whig Senators, I suppose it will be admitted, are not bound by the Democratic Convention resolution. [Mr. Dickinson, of New York, and others said, "Of course not."] Then that is settled. How is it with a Democratic Senator, whose State voted for Mr. Clay, and repudiated the Democratic Convention? That is my case. My State adopted the Constitution many years ago; and besides that, they refused to vote for Mr. Polk, or to approve this resolution in 1844. What is it expected of ME to do? To obey the Constitution, and follow the people of my State; or this resolution of a convention sent to Baltimore to NOMINATE A CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, but not to make CREDITS for the party? [Some one remarked, "Of course you are not bound as a Senator."] Very well; it is as a Senator I talk here, as a Senator I vote here, and as a Senator I heard these resolutions read here; and yet as a Senator I am not bound to heed them. That is a strange result after all we have heard of this matter. And in behalf of my Democratic neighbors, the Senators from South Carolina, I would respectfully inquire whether they were bound, and how far?—since South Carolina would not join the convention, and had no delegates in it. [Several voices: "Oh, yes; her delegates came in after."] I understand it: South Carolina delegates came into the nomination. However, I suspect that much of all this, intended or not intended, will be used to aid the cry of "Panic faith"—"Panic faith," of which I shall speak hereafter.

But in the next place, Mr. President, I presume to tell my Democratic associates who trust this new CREED upon me as a test of orthodoxy in the party, that they seem to me not to understand it themselves, and it were as well to look to that before any cry of treason shall be got up, either against the President, or against the Senate, or against an humble individual like myself. I charge the Senator from Illinois, and all other Senators who subscribe this as a CREED, and yet go for 54 deg. 40 min., with insisting upon more than the Baltimore Convention have recommended the

party to believe and do; and here is my proof. It truly says that Texas and Oregon are "great American" questions! You insist that Oregon is a "Western" question; and sometimes it is treated by you as a "party" question; and I am afraid that, by bringing it here, you will soon induce other persons (without Senators intending it) to convert it into a very dangerous presidential question—anti-democratic, anti-administration question, and trench others to PROSCRIBE those who cannot lay aside our original faith as we do our clothes, and, therefore, still believe that this is an "American" question, and that, like Texas, the "twin-sister to Oregon," the boundaries of Oregon ought to be left to a settlement by negotiation through the President and Senate of the U. States—the only constitutional organs for treating with foreign Governments.

But more than that, Mr. President: this CREED is in favor of the "RE-OCCUPATION OF OREGON." And that is what it recommended to our party. Ah! "re-occupation"—that's the word; not occupation but re-occupation. Now, we cannot "re-occupy" what we never "occupied" before. We never occupied the Oregon that lies north of the compromise line of 49 deg. before, but the Oregon on this side of that line we have heretofore occupied. Therefore we cannot re-occupy north of 49 deg., but we can re-occupy all south of that line! And that is exactly what the President has been endeavoring to do, and exactly what I am in favor of doing—"fight or no fight." Sir, if a Democrat thus comes fully up to this creed by his action, what gave Senators here the privilege to denounce him as untrue to the Democratic faith? This construction of the CREED is not hypercritical. What is "OREGON?" The country on the Columbia river and south of it—all lying between the line of 49 deg.—used to be Oregon. The old historians, maps, and geographers all had it so. It is a thing of modern origin to call any part of the territory north of 49 deg. "OREGON." There is, then, an old Oregon and a modern Oregon. The old Oregon was once occupied by us. Outside of that we have never occupied any portion of the modern Oregon; and therefore, if this CREED had gone for an occupation of Oregon, it might well be construed "all of Oregon," old and new. But as it only went for a "re-occupation," it is as clear as day that the CREED must be interpreted to mean the old Oregon up to 49 deg.; that same Oregon which lies south of 49 deg.; that same Oregon which the DEMOCRATS all go for still;—only some of us are not anxious to fight for ANY MORE! If we stand to the faith and keep the bond as it was written for us, will not that suffice? I think, Mr. President, I have disposed of the Baltimore resolutions generally and specially.

With unaffected pain did I hear a charge of "PUNIC FAITH" brought and repeated against the SOUTH, in this Senate, with respect to this Oregon notice, &c., and in a way that challenged a reply to it.

Personally I care nothing about it, as I voted for the Oregon bill last session; and some Senators know that my reason for voting against it the session before was, that its form appeared to me to violate the Constitution. [Mr. H. here explained at length his objections to the form of that notice. He also excused himself for voting to take up the Oregon bill last session, by stating that if he had known at the time (as he does now) how the negotiation then stood, he would not have voted for so much of that bill as proposed to take jurisdiction. But the Senate did not know the facts at that time, and they had not been told to him. He did not wonder at the offence that was taken by the British Parliament, who, no doubt, believed that we knew it all, at the time the bill passed the other House.] But I do not feel myself at liberty to let such an accusation grow into a proverb against the SOUTH. The SOUTH is my HOME; and such accusations have a baleful influence in kindling and preserving sectional feelings; I shall, therefore, expose its injustice, and then forbear. I shall do that by the Journals of the Senate now before me. I will read from the books, if any of my statements should be questioned. The charge of "Panic faith," the Senate will remember, was introduced here some days ago, when the honorable Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Colquhoun] had spoken of the course of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hannegan] upon the Texas question. The honorable Senator from Indiana said, in substance, as I understood him—(I have not his words before me)—that he had for some time desired a fit occasion to explain his vote against Texas, and now he had it; and that it was simply because he had foreseen "Panic faith—Panic faith." Then, or at some other time, he more than intimated that he had found that Panic faith in the South. Other Senators were formally called to the floor to vindicate that Senator, by their statements, showing that he really was suspicious of the South, of which I do not complain. Altogether the complexion given to this matter before the public eye was, that this "Panic faith" had been practised by one or more Southern Senators of the Democratic party! and the sagacity of the honorable Senator, it seems, enabled him to see it beforehand. In that way he explained his vote against Texas.

Now, Mr. President, there is a grave mistake in all this thing. In the first place, the Senator's memory deceived him as to the fact of his own vote. He did not vote against Texas! Upon the treaty he did not vote at all! For the Texas Resolutions, the next session, he voted ay! The Journals are before me, and these are facts. If contradicted, I will read the votes.

[Mr. HANNEGAN remarked: "I was present, and did not vote on the treaty."] No doubt of it; but present or absent was all the same. No single vote was worth having upon the treaty, for everybody knew in the Senate, almost from the beginning, that the treaty could not pass. The Senator will admit that. Then what basis for his charge is left?

In the second place, Mr. President, the resolution for notice, &c., on Oregon was rejected at that session—before the Baltimore Convention met! It was rejected by ayes and noes on the 21st of March! The convention met on 27th May! Now, what does the Senator think of his charge of "Panic faith, Panic faith?"

In the third place, every Democratic Senator save two—the two from South Carolina, [Messrs. Huger and McDuffie]—voted for the Oregon bill upon the test vote in the Senate at the session when Texas was passed through by the Senator's vote. The Senator from Indiana at that session held Texas in his hand—his single hand! Without his vote it could not have passed! Oregon lacked one vote to save it, Texas but one vote to kill it. What claim will he set up for sagacity, and

upon what grounds can he make this charge against the South, when he had only to have made the passage of the Oregon bill a sine qua non to his vote for Texas, and the thing would have been done,—both would have passed—always provided, the Oregon bill must have passed—always provided, he could have got a Southern Senator to make such a bargain with him! He had but two Senators to trade with, for all the rest of us voted for the Oregon bill without a price. That he did not drive a bargain for Oregon is no concern of mine.

[Mr. HAYWOOD here spoke of Mr. HUGER as an absent friend, whom he loved too well not to vindicate against unjust aspersions, and was about to proceed; when

Mr. HANNEGAN at once interrupted him by expressing the highest admiration and respect for Mr. HUGER, and disavowed all sort of intention to impute to him, an act, or even a thought of the slightest dishonor as a man or a Senator.]

Mr. HAYWOOD continued. That is enough, Mr. President. The other honorable Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McDuffie] is here, and very able to vindicate himself, if he thinks it is required. But I turn to higher topics. This is not a pleasant one.

Mr. President, in coming to the conclusions I have, which have been expressed to the Senate without evasion or disguise, and in taking my stand, as I believe, alongside of the Executive department of the Government, I took no counsel of Great Britain's strength to make me recede from the extreme claim of my own country. Were it MEXICO, or any still weaker and more distracted Government, if I knew my own heart, I would demand no more from it than I would insist upon against Great Britain,—our rights, our honorable rights, peaceably and in love. From neither, and from no other Government in the world, would I take what was not honorable for my own demand; nor go to war with any nation for either a profitable or an unprofitable wrong. I must be pardoned, therefore, for giving utterance to the sentiment, that an accusation of this kind against our own Government was neither just nor politic nor patriotic. The rest of the world will be easy to persuade, with American Senators to instruct them, that our country is mean enough to oppress the weak, and too cowardly to assert our rights against the strong. Great Britain will hardly find in that (if she believed it) a motive for surrendering "all of Oregon" without a fight, even if it should become necessary for her to fight us single-handed for it.

So, before God and the Senate, I do abjure and reprobate the sentiment of hatred to any nation as a motive for going back no further than the off-red compromise.

The venerated man whose image hangs constantly before us, and whose name should ever be his eulogy in an American Senate—GEORGE WASHINGTON—in his last words to the country, taught us "that the nation which indulges towards another habitual hatred is in some degree a slave; and the Declaration of American Independence has sanctified it as a political maxim of this republic, 'to hold Great Britain, as we hold the rest of mankind, ENEMIES (only) in WAR, but in PEACE FRIENDS.'" There is nothing that has tempted me to forget, and nothing shall drive me to violate, the counsel of my country's father, nor this fundamental maxim of free American institutions. Neither will I teach the people to do it. Good men could not applaud the Senate for it. Heaven would not excuse its practical application, nor fail, perhaps, to visit the consequences upon the nation itself.

Without going into our title to the Territory, (which, if the Senate choose, can be done hereafter) and whenever the bill for making jurisdiction over Oregon, or "any portion of it," comes up for consideration, I will tell you, in very few words, the ground of right upon which (if there were no other) I would put my vindication. I believe it is the political RIGHT of my country to stretch itself without any interruption by foreign Governments from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from sea to sea on this continent—according as we ourselves shall judge it expedient or not. That we acquired that RIGHT upon this continent when our INDEPENDENCE was established, subject only to the proviso, that we must not do so as to deny the like privilege to our neighbors, nor interfere with settlements permanently made before our Independence was established, nor with similar rights belonging to or by them, nor act with injustice to the Aborigines. What we claim a right to do, we must not deny to the CANADAS. It is a sort of National pre-emption right to both. Great Britain cannot rightfully complain so long as we do not deny to her, as the mother country of the CANADAS, the same right equally with ourselves. She cannot rightfully interrupt our enjoyment of that right. And if she does, then we CANNOT SUBMIT TO IT. Our dividing line is at 49 deg. on this side of the mountains; and if it is straightened to the Pacific on the other in harmony, we ought to be satisfied. In settling that line between the two Governments, the great law of "love and good will to man" requires concessions for equivalents, to be agreed for by mutual consent, and they should be mutually made for the convenience of each other; and such are fit subjects for friendly negotiation.

This Senate, Mr. President, are more familiar with the doctrines and the learning of books about antiquity and continuity than I profess to be; and they might well complain of me if I enlarged upon those topics. My constituents are a plain republican people, who generally do not care to be enlightened by such treatises. As many of them as do, will read for themselves. By the Constitution they have entrusted the making of TREATIES with the President and Senate. They are satisfied with the Constitution as it is, and patriotically disposed in all parties to take sides with their country. I mean "the People" are. They will feel and understand this assertion of our right to grow and multiply when in the providence of God the country wants to do it; and I doubt not it will vindicate me. At any rate, they put me in this Senate to act on questions of this sort, questions of treaty-making, and to advise the President according to my best judgment, upon the responsibility of my own conscience, and I shall govern myself accordingly; accountable to God that my motives are good, to my associates that my speech be frank, to the people only that I DO RIGHT.

What the end of these things may be, if the Senate shall come to the same conclusion with me, must depend upon the course Great Britain may pursue, upon the subject of a compromise. Of that I know nothing. I only know what she ought to do, and that I trust in God she will do. (One thing is certain—it will bring us to the end.

It does not aid negotiation it will not hinder it. I believe Great Britain desires peace, because it is her interest to do it. Her Minister is still here—the Minister of Peace—the Minister of Peace from a Christian people and a Christian Government. Why should we doubt the result? He will hardly leave before he has at least told us what is that "FURTHER PROPOSAL MORE CONSISTENT WITH FAIRNESS AND EQUITY," which he trusted the American Government would make to him, (pp. 11, 69.) Sir, the civilized world would execrate the Ministers of both Governments if this negotiation should be terminated upon any point of personal or diplomatic etiquette. Christian lands are not to be involved in wars at this day for the personal pique of their agents. Ministers of peace do not seek occasion for a quarrel; but, if really inclined to compromise, they would be looked upon as miserable bunglers, when either or both of them cannot find in their own correspondence, or elsewhere, a reason or a pretext for making any offer that would prove acceptable to both. If THERE BE ANY SUCH, leave all that to them, and there let the responsibility rest, undivided by us.

This matter can be compromised, if the two Governments are willing to do it. If Great Britain does not intend to compromise, we ought to know it; let her not have the excuse for it that the President was against "all compromise," but in favor of "all Oregon or none." She shall not be permitted to say that misconstruction of the American Senate by some Senators, was neither refuted nor contradicted by any other.

This notice is no threat at all; and I do not expect it is either to intimidate Great Britain or to offend her. But hitherto neither of the two Governments seemed to have realized the necessity of terminating this last cause of dispute between them, and of opening the way wider for the cultivation of a permanent national concord.

Whatever may be their course or their condition it seems to me that WE are no longer left at liberty to postpone a final settlement of this whole controversy about Oregon. The public will, expressed through their immediate delegates in the other House, is very conclusive upon that point. Another Presidential election, and every other question will be made subordinate to this one for "Our Rights."

The public mind, already pre-occupied by one-sided arguments upon our title to the whole of Oregon, will be in no state to discuss it; the people will be excited and misled by denunciations against every man who has the moral courage hereafter to doubt it, and even taught to call him "British;" the prudency of age will be deceived as the counsels of a foreign influence by a hired press; the wisdom of statesmen will be set aside by the clamors of selfish demagogues; the love of peace and the fear of God denounced by factions, and vilified by self-constituted associations, as the cowardice of traitors and the affectation of hypocrisy. It will soon become the unholy work of an infuriated party spirit, aided by selfish ambition, to create and produce in our happy country this, and much more than this;—all, as I apprehend, for the sake of putting great men down, and exalting little men to high places, more than it will be for the purpose of securing our national rights. Senators and others who would scorn to play the game are incautiously furnished the cards—"All of Oregon, or none." Our title is "clear and unquestionable." The Administration is with us—"Down with the treacherous Democrat 'British' Whig who opens his mouth for compromise!" These cries will be so many obstacles to Peace!—honorable peace. As we would keep the power over this subject in the hands to which the CONSTITUTION has entrusted it, we would protect the trust committed to the SENATE, and do our whole duty to the cause of LIBERTY REGULATED BY LAW, to God, and to our consciences—I think the Senate should aid to bring this controversy to a conclusion, in some way or other, as soon as possible. Another year, and it may be too late to settle it in peace. Another three years' delay, and it will not be settled without a dreadful conflict of political agitations at home, and perhaps a desperate war between two Christian nations. God deliver us from both!

If the trusts of this body under the Constitution must be carried for discussion beforehand to the court-houses and party caucuses of the land—if we must encounter the agitations and perils and bitterness of a popular oration, in our foreign affairs—will not the Senate agree that it is safer and wiser to take care that the pleading shall be made up so as to present the TRUE ISSUES? Notice or no notice is an old question—pre-determined and pre-judged; and the peace of the country can hardly be preserved if we suffer that to be the issue which goes before the country. Let us give the notice, then, to the President's hands, before the negotiation is closed, and, if there is a compromise, the question will go to the people upon that. The result is, to my mind, neither doubtful nor fearful. If no compromise that we can accept with honor shall be offered now, it never will be offered; and then we shall soon have the whole subject before us, and can take such steps as will protect our rights and carry this question into our popular elections upon fair and true issues. But there has been a doubt excited lest the President might abuse the notice after we have authorized it, and you hesitate. Is there not more danger from our delay, than in any trust we may repose in the Executive by giving him the use of this notice, even if he should abuse it? Friends of the Administration—DEMOCRATS—surely WE can confide in him, else we ought not to be his friends. Confidence is not to be expected with so much alacrity from those who have been his political opponents, especially when some of ourselves have misconstrued the President. But, WHOIS of the Senate, do you still doubt his position? Do you fear he may abuse this notice after it is given to him, (as it has been said he would,) by abruptly closing negotiation, and even refusing it be returned to him? To such are are resolved to stand by him AT THAT LINE OF COMPROMISE, and to NO OTHERS, do I appeal. I have said already that if you do not mean to stop concession at that line, you do right in refusing the notice. He cannot speak upon that point; official propriety forbids it, as I have already said and proved. But here is a guaranty. Let him but venture to occupy that position contrary to your hopes and expectations. Let him only attempt to betray the confidence you put in his conduct. (Oh! he will not do it. I feel like I was defending a friend's honor, when I say again, and again, and again, that this construction CANNOT be true.) But what if he should attempt it? The

of the people, where do the Democrats expect to find a Presidential candidate? Who will be our President after we have expelled all our biggest men? Sir, I am sure I do not know.

[Mr. HANNEGAN remarked: "Take him from amongst the people, where we get our best men."]

Oh! Ay, then he is to be taken from among the people, is he—without resorting to such statesmen as those I have named? We shall see how ever, whether the people agree to have this game played after a three year's notice.

There is a mistake, however, Mr. President, in what the Senator from Indiana exclaimed, at his first sight of my imperfect picture. In my State, let me tell that Senator, when Democrats talk of "the people," we mean "the masses"—the "bone and sinew" of the land, as distinguished from the statesmen, lawyers, politicians, and such like. In that sense, I deny that President Polk was got for a candidate from among "the people." He has been a politician all his life, and we knew it when he was nominated. Thank God for it!—he has now proved himself to have been more—one of the STATESMEN of this great country. And if he will still stand up by the side of Washington, as he has done, and I hope he will do, he will be entitled to our lasting admiration. That sort of flattery to the people would not take at all with "the people" in my part of the world, and I should be sorry to think it would tickle the people very much anywhere. A man is no worse, as a man, because he does not possess the learning and political experience which are requisite to fit him for the position of Chief Magistrate of the United States. Nobody pretends to that. But it is a great evil when everybody thinks he is fit to be the President; and my friend from Indiana should stand up before a crowd of honest Democrats in my State and talk to "the people," the "real people," the "masses," there—the men who drive their own ploughs, make their own carts, &c., and quietly pursue their occupation at home—about NOMINATING ONE OF THEM FOR PRESIDENT, they would do what I will not—laugh in his face, and tell him that he might as well talk of getting a blacksmith to mend watches.

But let me ask the attention of Senators whilst I give to the Baltimore resolution a more partial notice. It has been often referred to in the Senate, and no one has answered. I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Breese] is entitled to the distinction of having first read it in Senate. He did not have the Secretary to read it, but read it himself: Next year for the next step! The Senate, having no wish to misrepresent me, need not be asked to remember that I shall have nothing to say against the convention or its members. The resolution which has been gravely read, and often relied upon as deserving great weight and consideration in our deliberations, is my subject; not the convention. The resolution on Oregon is simply this: The declaration of opinions by a party convention recommending opinions to the people which were unanimously adopted by the convention. That is its precise character. They are before me.

"Resolved, That our title to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other Power; and that the re-occupation of Oregon, and the re-annexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democratic party of this Union."

It is remarkable how this resolution has acquired so much importance now, when it was not even thought worthy of being communicated to Mr. Polk at that time by its authors. I have before me, in Niles's Register, the letter informing him of his nomination, and expecting to elect him; and his reply accepts the nomination, hoping they may. That is about the whole of it. In good taste, and enough said. If any Senator wishes it, I will read the letters. Here they are. But not a word about Oregon—not a syllable. No pledges made, and none required. In truth, we all know that the Baltimore Convention was not called to instruct or to express opinions for the party, but simply to choose a DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE. So you come round again to Mr. Polk's nomination for President, and which has not changed to this day. Of that I have already spoken.

Then whom does this resolution bind? Why brought into this Senate? But before you answer me, recollect there were two Baltimore Conventions. [Some person said—"three."] I know, but I don't count the Tyler Convention. [A good deal of laughter took place at this remark, and Mr. H. said, "I mean no sneer—no offence to any one."] The Whig Senators, I suppose it will be admitted, are not bound by the Democratic Convention resolution. [Mr. Dickinson, of New York, and others said, "Of course not."] Then that is settled. How is it with a Democratic Senator, whose State voted for Mr. Clay, and repudiated the Democratic Convention? That is my case. My State adopted the Constitution many years ago; and besides that, they refused to vote for Mr. Polk, or to approve this resolution in 1844. What is it expected of ME to do? To obey the Constitution, and follow the people of my State; or this resolution of a convention sent to Baltimore to NOMINATE A CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, but not to make CREDITS for the party? [Some one remarked, "Of course you are not bound as a Senator."] Very well; it is as a Senator I talk here, as a Senator I vote here, and as a Senator I heard these resolutions read here; and yet as a Senator I am not bound to heed them. That is a strange result after all we have heard of this matter. And in behalf of my Democratic neighbors, the Senators from South Carolina, I would respectfully inquire whether they were bound, and how far?—since South Carolina would not join the convention, and had no delegates in it. [Several voices: "Oh, yes; her delegates came in after."] I understand it: South Carolina delegates came into the nomination. However, I suspect that much of all this, intended or not intended, will be used to aid the cry of "Panic faith"—"Panic faith," of which I shall speak hereafter.

But in the next place, Mr. President, I presume to tell my Democratic associates who trust this new CREED upon me as a test of orthodoxy in the party, that they seem to me not to understand it themselves, and it were as well to look to that before any cry of treason shall be got up, either against the President, or against the Senate, or against an humble individual like myself. I charge the Senator from Illinois, and all other Senators who subscribe this as a CREED, and yet go for 54 deg. 40 min., with insisting upon more than the Baltimore Convention have recommended the

party to believe and do; and here is my proof. It truly says that Texas and Oregon are "great American" questions! You insist that Oregon is a "Western" question; and sometimes it is treated by you as a "party" question; and I am afraid that, by bringing it here, you will soon induce other persons (without Senators intending it) to convert it into a very dangerous presidential question—anti-democratic, anti-administration question, and trench others to PROSCRIBE those who cannot lay aside our original faith as we do our clothes, and, therefore, still believe that this is an "American" question, and that, like Texas, the "twin-sister to Oregon," the boundaries of Oregon ought to be left to a settlement by negotiation through the President and Senate of the U. States—the only constitutional organs for treating with foreign Governments.

But more than that, Mr. President: this CREED is in favor of the "RE-OCCUPATION OF OREGON." And that is what it recommended to our party. Ah! "re-occupation"—that's the word; not occupation but re-occupation. Now, we cannot "re-occupy" what we never "occupied" before. We never occupied the Oregon that lies north of the compromise line of 49 deg. before, but the Oregon on this side of that line we have heretofore occupied. Therefore we cannot re-occupy north of 49 deg., but we can re-occupy all south of that line! And that is exactly what the President has been endeavoring to do, and exactly what I am in favor of doing—"fight or no fight." Sir, if a Democrat thus comes fully up to this creed by his action, what gave Senators here the privilege to denounce him as untrue to the Democratic faith? This construction of the CREED is not hypercritical. What is "OREGON?" The country on the Columbia river and south of it—all lying between the line of 49 deg.—used to be Oregon. The old historians, maps, and geographers all had it so. It is a thing of modern origin to call any part of the territory north of 49 deg. "OREGON." There is, then, an old Oregon and a modern Oregon. The old Oregon was once occupied by us. Outside of that we have never occupied any portion of the modern Oregon; and therefore, if this CREED had gone for an occupation of Oregon, it might well be construed "all of Oregon," old and new. But as it only went for a "re-occupation," it is as clear as day that the CREED must be interpreted to mean the old Oregon up to 49 deg.; that same Oregon which lies south of 49 deg.; that same Oregon which the DEMOCRATS all go for still;—only some of us are not anxious to fight for ANY MORE! If we stand to the faith and keep the bond as it was written for us, will not that suffice? I think, Mr. President, I have disposed of the Baltimore resolutions generally and specially.

With unaffected pain did I hear a charge of "PUNIC FAITH" brought and repeated against the SOUTH, in this Senate, with respect to this Oregon notice, &c., and in a way that challenged a reply to it.

Personally I care nothing about it, as I voted for the Oregon bill last session; and some Senators know that my reason for voting against it the session before was, that its form appeared to me to violate the Constitution. [Mr. H. here explained at length his objections to the form of that notice. He also excused himself for voting to take up the Oregon bill last session, by stating that if he had known