

by the stripling
 these arguments
 ove our title or
 No, sir. Why,
 echo, in words,
 the British Gov-
 ernments, by the pro-
 nouncements. They are
 unjust and un-
 known Britain to
 on, for centuries
 mulgating to the
 ery does not fur-
 by what means
 ? In the very
 means she now
 gling smuggler,
 marauding free-
 r accident, lands
 ins a short time
 r repairs; he
 the name of his
 discovered or ex-
 turns to England
 portant discove-
 nie makes a grant
 their intrusion by
 etter title, Eng-
 gotiation; but if
 at that time to
 wise engaged), a
 stment of claims
 diplomatic con-
 upon, by which
 d in which are
 as and complica-
 of future contro-
 maxims that Bri-
 planting in it the
 ic rolls on. Her
 ripen into what
 uses to go back
 upon them, in-
 rms as she con-
 tely monopolize
 ime for her she
 laries, proposes
 npromise, with-
 ee of the origin
 e not yielded to,
 es that her fleets
 d, the regiments
 t at the world.
 r, and thus co-
 the terms of the
 he lion's share.
 xperiment upon
 planted herself
 construes it in
 ng to the entire
 upon. In 1788,
 er, visits Nootka
 Meares is chan-
 his claims have
 ses." In 1815
 onal right, and
 or possession.

In 1845 it has grown into a joint right; a tenancy in common in an empire territory of nine hundred miles in extent, of which she now demands partition.

Sir, the possession of a large part of the British empire was acquired by the terror of her arms; and is held at this day by the same tenure; with her metals in cannon and in coin she frightens the timid and bribes the venal. Her long career of national aggression has justly entitled her to the appellation of "plunderer of nations and the robber of the world." Sir, I would not be so unwise as to underrate the power of her arms or the diplomacy of her Cabinet. I would carefully study the prowess of her achievements, the strength of her arms, the history of her aggressions, the principles of her policy, and the mode of its execution; but never, sir, no, never! while I had a country of my own, or a heart to love it, would I become the eulogist of her greatness, the pander of her interests, or the apologist of her crimes. No, sir; rather would I turn to the historic pages of our revolutionary sires, who achieved our independence and founded our institutions, and learn from them the price of our national freedom, and the true principles of policy to preserve them. Rather would I contemplate the glory of our achievements by land and sea in the war of 1812. Rather would I trace the growth of our power and the perfection of our policy from that time to the present, and carefully examine and compare our present strength with that of our adversary, and then calculate the chances of success. It is alike unwise to exalt or depreciate the power of your adversary, or vaingloriously to boast or cowardly to disparage your own.

Mr. Chairman, one passing remark. Should I ever be so unfortunate, either by choice, accident, or in obedience to the behest of some superior leader, as to find myself placed upon the anti-American side of any great national question, I trust I shall never seek extrication from that position by availing myself of the aid of any of that ephemeral spawn of venal scribblers, who infest every capitol and pollute every paper. But, sir, some gentlemen tell us this is a President-making question. I have but a single remark upon that subject. If any of the aspirants to the succession, or their friends, seek promotion to that high office by gambling

with the rights of their country, or the integrity of her soil, upon the political chessboard, they will find the waysides of the road to the *White House street* with dead politicians. The American people will never by their suffrages elevate any man to office, who would promote his own personal aggrandizement by abandoning or sacrificing the interests of his country. Sir, we are told that this is a western question, and that western men compose a war party. What advantage does the West gain by maintaining our rights in Oregon, more than the East? None, sir, none. Nay more, the eastern cities would be the largest gainers. When the means of communication and the channels of trade are opened up and established, connecting the Atlantic cities with those of the Pacific, and these commercial points are bound together by the ties of interest, of kindred, and of blood, will not the commercial men of the East have a much greater interest in Oregon than the agriculturists of the western valley?

Sir, the western people are a peaceable people; they desire no unjust war, no war of aggression. They full well know and appreciate the devastations and horrors of war, and also the blessings of peace. They rejoice in the maintenance of that peace; but, sir, it is not with the joy of fear. They would forbear long and endure much before they would destroy our peaceful relations with the world. But they will never consent to purchase that peace, dear as it may be, by a sacrifice of national honor or national interest.

Mr. Chairman, we say to those gentlemen, be just, and fear not; ascertain clearly the extent of our just rights in that country; demand no more, take no less; "ask nothing but what is clearly right, submit to nothing that is wrong." And we say further to them, that the friends of Oregon will never consent to barter one acre of its soil, nor one tree of its forests, to which we have a good title, for *cotton-bags or corn-laws, calico prints, cod-fish, or fancy stocks*. But should war come of this—should the sword once be drawn—I would advise my countrymen to throw away the scabbard, and never sheath that sword until the last bloody track of the British lion was blotted out from American soil, and his last talon cut loose from the continent. He is at best but an unwelcome and dangerous neighbor.