

citing the people of the country on the merits of the Oregon claim, for the purpose of directing their force against a province, to which we have no claim, and to any attempt to take which directly, they could not, as an honest people, be brought. Was there ever a war, more infamous and atrocious than that would be?

But, Sir, I observe by the watch before me, that I have less than half a minute left me. I have many things I would like to say on this subject, and I regret for this time, and for this only, the existence of your hour rule.

Here the chairman's hammer came down.

TO MY CONSTITUENTS.

The one hour rule of the House of Representatives made it impossible for me to discuss the question of title at all, without neglecting every other point entirely. The presentation of the mere historical detail would have taken more than the entire hour. I find no fault whatever with the settled practice of gentlemen in writing out "what they would have said if they had had time," and especially when they signify their intention to do so at the time they speak. As a general proposition, it is right and proper they should do so. But for myself, in this particular case, I have preferred to report, verbatim et literatim, what I did say—without the intentional addition or subtraction of a single idea or word. Otherwise, I should have made copious quotations from the numbers just published by Mr. Gallatin. Had I seen those numbers before I spoke, I should have declared my intention to do so; and then, without any difficulty, could have selected whatever I deemed important to strengthen my own views on the subject. But I had not read a line of either one of them.

I can now only call the attention of such, as have no better employment than to give an hour to the foregoing speech, to the four numbers signed Albert Gallatin, appearing in the last few days in the National Intelligencer—the last of the series this morning. I will here only quote, in Mr. Gallatin's own words, his statement of the propositions which he meant to establish; and which, more than any other writer or speaker, I think he has established. He says:

It has been attempted in these papers to prove—

1st. That neither of the two Powers has an absolute and indisputable right to the whole contested territory; that each may recede from its extreme pretensions without impairing national honor or wounding national pride; and that the way is therefore still open for a renewal of negotiations.

2d. That the avowed object of the United States, in giving notice of the abrogation of the convention, is the determination to assert and maintain their assumed right of absolute and exclusive sovereignty over the whole territory; that Great Britain is fully committed on that point, and has constantly and explicitly declared that such an attempt would be resisted, and the British interests in that quarter be protected; and that war is therefore the unavoidable consequence of such a decisive step—a war not only necessarily calamitous and expensive, but in its character aggressive—not justifiable by the magnitude and importance of its object, and of which the chances are uncertain.

3d. That the inconveniences of the present state of things may in a great degree be avoided; that, if no war should ensue, they will be the same, if not greater, without than under a convention; that not a single object can be gained by giving the notice at this time, unless it be to do something not permitted by the present convention, and therefore provoking resistance and productive of war. If a single other advantage can be gained by giving the notice, let it be stated.

4th. That it has been fully admitted by Great Britain that, whether under or without a convention, the United States have the same rights as herself, to trade, to navigate, and to occupy and make settlements in and over every part of the territory; and that, if this state of things be not disturbed, natural causes must necessarily give the whole territory to the United States.