

mitted to be in dis-

United States de-  
 states have always  
 ction over the Ore-  
 this Government  
 s well known, led  
 ch provide for the  
 rican citizens and  
 laws of their own  
 ion, therefore, we  
 efraining from the  
 ction over any por-  
 r and unquestion-  
 oment the twelve  
 ction or occupation  
 and to the national  
 to extend the ex-  
 country, as far at  
 s. Therefore, sir,  
 solutely involving  
 not flatter them-  
 the notice, as pro-  
 mittee, and with-  
 is to be followed.  
 risdiction not only  
 citizens have taken  
 subjects and many  
 territory, compris-  
 ent has on several  
 knowledge as ex-  
 w, Mr. Chairman,  
 and the people of  
 ain should adopt  
 he notice, and pro-  
 tend her sovereign-  
 f our laws and the  
 not a man in this  
 ; who would not  
 ain as equivalent  
 d by all the energy  
 ch circumstances,  
 this country, why  
 d people of Great  
 s, if the measures

which have been brought forward shall be consummated? Sir, they will not. No man of ordinary sagacity, I venture to say, thinks they will. They cannot, without being disgraced in the opinion of all Europe. Therefore, those who say or think that the adoption of these measures will not produce war, have not, in my judgment, well considered the subject, and have arrived at a most perilous conclusion. Some gentlemen seem to suppose, that if we give the notice, and show a bold front, as they are pleased to term it, that Great Britain will abandon the territory without a struggle; that she does not regard it as of sufficient value to justify her in going to war for it; that she only desires a fair pretext to relinquish it. And they seem to suppose that we have nothing more to do than to pass the notice and extend our laws over the country. It may be proper, sir, to remind those gentlemen of what Great Britain said on this subject in 1826. Mr. Gallatin, in his letter to Mr. Clay, dated London, November 16, of that year, says:

“Mr. Huskisson, amongst the reasons for taking up that subject first, [Oregon,] mentioned that it had for several sessions occupied the attention of Congress, and that it was not possible to foresee the effect which the measures they might adopt would have on the question, and on the friendly relations of the two countries. In a subsequent part of the conversation he said that the joint occupancy would cease in 1828 unless renewed, and the removal by the United States of any settlement made by British subjects would be considered as an act of aggression.”

If Great Britain in 1826 would have regarded, as her negotiator expressly declared she would, the removal of any of her subjects from that territory by the authorities of the United States as an act of aggression, can it be supposed that she will now be less firm in the assertion of her rights? That, after having strengthened her title by twenty years more of uninter-  
 rupted occupation, and the number of her subjects and settle-  
 ments in that country having probably quadrupled, and her  
 power to protect and defend them having vastly increased, can  
 it be supposed, by any one who is not blinded by party zeal,  
 that she will quietly and ingloriously relinquish her rights in a  
 territory to which she has adhered with so much tenacity for  
 more than half a century? And yet those who are most zealous  
 for the passage of these measures are leading the people to  
 suppose that their tendency will be to do away with all sub-  
 jects of discord, and leave the two countries in the quiet en-  
 joyment of peace. But we are assured, that if, unfortunately,  
 they should lead to war, we shall have no difficulty in con-  
 quering our ancient foe. We are to rush into the struggle  
 without preparation, and almost without arms in our hands.  
 We are told that republics never prepare for war; and gentle-  
 men seem to apprehend, that if we stop to count the cost, or