Provincial Legislature.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY—FREDERICTON.

Saturday, February 28.

REVENUE BILL.—On motion of Mr. Partelow, the House went into Committee of the whole in further consideration of Ways and Means of raising a Revenue in the Province—Mr. Payne in the chair of the Committee; when the following resolution was moved:

Resolved, as the opinion of this Committee, that the present Duties now imposed upon articles imported into this Province should be continued, with the exception of the duties on Wheat, Wheat and Rye Flour, Corn Meal and Oatmeal.

To which an amendment was moved—To add to the exceptions, after the word "Oatmeal," and Leather. And upon the question for adopting the amendment, the Committee divided—Yeas, 5; Nays, 20. Whereupon it was decided in the negative. The question was then taken upon the original resolution, when the Committee again divided—Yeas, 21; Nays, 3. And so it was carried in the affirmative.

On Tuesday, March 3d, the Committee on Roads sat until nearly three o'clock; after the Committee returned to their places, the House was occupied in considering "A Bill for the more effectual Administration of Justice," which had been sent down from the Council for concurrence; this led to a short but animated debate, which terminated in the bill being lost. Immediately after the disposal of this Bill, Mr. Partelow informed the House that—The Committee appointed to take into consideration what sums it may be necessary to grant for repairing and improving the Roads throughout the Province, recommend that the following sums should be granted and appropriated as follows:—

GREAT ROADS.

St. John to Nova-Scotia Line, (£600 of which to be applied to the improvement of the Great Marsh in the vicinity of St. John,)	£2000
St. John to St. Andrews,	700
Fredericton to St. John *via* Nerepis, (Such sum as may be necessary from the two last-mentioned Grants to be applied in repairing the approaches to the Steam Boat Landing, in Carleton.)	1000
Nerepis to Gagetown,	65
Dorchester to Shediac,	80
Shediac to Petitcodiac,	50
Richibucto to Chatham,	400
Newcastle to Bathurst,	300
Bathurst to Campbellton,	830
Fredericton to Woodstock, (including Nackawick Bridge, east side,)	1050
Woodstock to Aroostook,	500
Aroostook to Grand Falls,	600
Fredericton to Finger Board,	400
Bellisle to St. John,	150
Fredericton to Newcastle,	1000
Fredericton to St. Andrews,	600
Salisbury to Hopewell,	450
Shediac to Richibucto,	700
Waweig to St. Stephen,	150
Woodstock to Houlton,	150
Oromocto to Gagetown,	180
Oak Bay to Eel River,	500
Fredericton to Bend of Petitcodiac,	500
Grand Falls to Canada Line,	500
Bathurst to Miramichi, (via Pokemouche,)	400
St. John to Quaco,	250
Hampton to Bellisle,	100
TOTAL	£13,500

SPECIAL GRANTS.

Towards Bridge over south-west Miramichi,	£400
New line of Road to Mechanics' Settlement of Albert and King's Counties,	100
Hammond River to Hopewell,	100
New bridge over Crooked Creek, County of Albert,	60
Loch Lomond to Sussex Vale,	150
Bridge near Smith's, Hammond River,	75
Campbellton to Upsalquitch,	200
From the River to Gillan's, and thence to the Victoria Settlement,	150
Little River Mills to a new Settlement above the Mills, Sunbury,	80
From Nerepis Road to Douglas Valley road, Pocaweo to St. Stephen,	50
Chamcook to Pleasant Ridge,	160
Waweig to *Roix's*,	50
Trout Creek Bridge, on the Great Road leading to Finger Board,	70
Cole's Island to New Canaan,	50
Bend to Richibucto, *via* Irishtown,	100
Road leading to French Settlement, Saint Nicholas River,	60
For the Nashwaak Bridge,	250
Bay Verte to Gaspereau River,	125
Road to Mountain Settlement,	60
Bridge over Great Presqu' Isle,	250
Road over Shippegan Plains,	100
For the Big Nepisiquit Road towards Northumberland,	80
New Road—Blakslee's Farm to L. Lomond,	150
Road to Mount Theobald Settlement,	50
New Road from Quaco to Albert County,	100
TOTAL	£3,670

BYE ROAD APPROPRIATIONS.

York,	£1233	15	0
Carleton,	1232	10	0
Queen's,	1150	0	0
Gloucester,	875	0	0
Charlotte,	1357	10	0
King's,	1317	10	0
St. John,	983	10	0
Sunbury,	694	0	0
Northumberland,	1296	5	0
Restigouche,	693	15	0
Westmoreland,	1130	0	0
Kent,	842	10	0
Albert,	693	15	0
TOTAL	£13,500	0	0

Total appropriations for Road Service, 1846,—£30,070.

The amount recommended towards the Bridge over the South-west Branch of the Miramichi, is £500 below the estimate for such work. The balance, it is understood by the Committee, will be appropriated at the next meeting of the Legislature.

[The report was signed by every member of the Committee, and was accepted by the House.]

SCHOOL GRANTS, &c.—£400 for the support of the Madras Schools throughout the Province; £150 towards the support of the Roman Catholic School in St. John; £30 in aid of individual subscription towards the Free School in the Parish of Portland—the same to be expended by the board of commissioners for the Roman Catholic School of St. John; £50 for a Missionary for the Melicite Tribe of Indians stationed at Fredericton for the year 1846.

Revenue Bill.—This morning the House was in Committee of the whole, on the Revenue Bill, Mr. Partelow in the Chair. So well was the pledge of the House, when in Committee of Ways and Means, carried out, that this important Bill, continuing the Bill of last year, with the exception of Bread Stuffs, was disposed of in less than five minutes—not a word said against its passing by any member of the House. This Bill being disposed of, the House went into a Committee of the Whole, on the Registry Bill, brought in by Mr. Brown, which led to a very protracted debate. The principle of Mr. Brown's Bill is sustained by a very small majority, but it will likely undergo some important amendments in Committee; in the mean time progress was reported.—*Head Quarters, March 4.*

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY.—The business of the Session is rapidly proceeding, and from the amount of routine duty performed, compared with the time since the House sat, we should not wonder to see the consummation early in April. On Wednesday the House again took up the Registry Bill introduced by Mr. Brown, and after a long debate, the principle of the Bill was sustained, on an amendment for its postponement for 2 months, which was lost 13 to 15. The principal opponents of this Bill were Messrs. Partelow, Hanington, Jordan, Thompson, Barberie, End, &c., and its advocates the hon. mover, Mr. Hill, Mr. J. A. Street, Mr. W. H. Street, Dr. Earle, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Wark, &c.—The great argument brought against the Bill, was its giving such an extraordinary degree of power to the Parish Assessors, as to name who *should*, and who should *not*, be deemed capable of voting. We may also add that several amendments will be brought in when the details of the Bill are brought under discussion. For the County of York, Mr. Taylor alone voted on this question; the other three members being prevented by indisposition from attending in their places. Yesterday the House was broken up in Committee during the early part of the day, and after business was resumed, nothing of importance transpired. A Bill for incorporating the Barrister's Society was passed; and the division line between the Counties of Queen's and Sunbury afterwards came under discussion on a Bill introduced by Mr. Scoullar. Some remark made by Mr. Wilmot near the close of the debate, it appeared gave personal offence to Mr. Scoullar, who moved the "standing order," and on our return to the Gallery all was quiet again.—*Reporter, March 6.*

New-Brunswick and Canadian Boundary.

The following is a copy of the Address forwarded to the Imperial Government, on the subject of the disputed Boundary between New-Brunswick and Canada.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

The Joint and Humble Address of Her Majesty's Legislative Council and House of Assembly of the Province of New Brunswick, in General Assembly convened.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

We, the Legislative Council and Assembly of New Brunswick, in Provincial Parliament assembled, beg leave to approach Your Majesty with renewed assurances of our devoted attachment to Your Majesty's Person and Government.

The occasion of this, our Humble and Dutiful Address, is one of vital importance to the present and future interests of this Province; and confident in the justice of the claims now to be preferred for Your Majesty's Royal consideration, we cannot for a moment doubt the decision which your Majesty will be graciously pleased to pronounce in the premises.

From the first erection of this province into a separate Government, in the year 1785, down to the year 1842, the Territorial Rights, as well as the Legal Jurisdiction of this Province, have been undisputed on the Upper St. John and its Tributaries, save by the American Government.

During the whole of that period, the Government of this Province exercised jurisdiction over the said Territory, and the inhabitants residing thereon, in like manner, as in other parts of the Province, (viz.) by granting Lands, organizing Militia, appointing Magistrates and Parish Officers, making Roads and building Bridges, relieving the Poor, serving Writs and Processes of every description, and granting Licences to cut Logs and Timber; and even pending the dispute with the American Government, the accustomed Jurisdiction was retained by this Province, except in the disposal of Lands and Timber, which was suspended by agreement between the two nations.

Upon the Treaty of Washington being concluded, we reasonably supposed that our accustomed Jurisdiction would be continued without interruption over the residue of the Territory; but to our astonishment we learned in 1843 that the Canadian Government for the first time had asserted a right by selling Logs and Timber from the Lands on the Rivers St. Francis, and other Rivers and Streams in that vicinity.

Knowing that the Southern Boundary of Canada had been already defined by the Act of Parliament 14th Geo. 3, cap. 83, and that by no possible construction of that Act could its Southern Boundary be extended to include any of the Rivers flowing into the Main Saint John, and thence to the Sea; we hoped that the remonstrances of the Government of this Province would at once have put an end to the unwarrantable claims of Canada, and prevented as from further interruption; but we regret to inform Your Majesty, that in this respect we have been disappointed, and that at the present time, the two Provinces are exercising a conflicting jurisdiction.

The Province of Canada is described in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and by the Act above referred to, as being "Bounded on the South by a "Line from the Bay of Chaleurs along the High "Lands which divide the Rivers that fall into the "River St. Lawrence, from those which fall into "the Sea to a point in 45° of Northern latitude "on the Eastern Bank of the River Connecticut." And we entertain not the smallest doubt, that it will appear as clearly to Your Gracious Majesty as it does to us, that no part of the Province of Canada can possibly be situated on the Southern side of the Line described with so much clearness in the said Act, and which cannot any time be surveyed and marked upon the ground without difficulty.

Yet notwithstanding the explicit language of the Act thus defining the Boundary, the Canadian Government now so far overstep the same, as to claim as their Southern Boundary, a Line running from the Mouth of Restigouche River to Mars Hill, as indicated by the Yellow Line on the Map hereunto annexed; a claim, which, if sustained, would deprive this Province of more than one quarter of its territory.

Having brought under Your Majesty's notice the former occupation and jurisdiction of this Province, together with the Southern Boundary of Canada as fixed by Act of Parliament, in contrast with the present claims of that Province, we would now respectfully submit for Your Royal consideration the equitable as well as legal right of this Province to the Territory in question, arising out of the compact entered into between Your Majesty's late Royal Uncle, of revered and blessed memory, and the Legislature of this Province.

By the Provincial enactment, 8th Wm. 4, cap. 1, entitled "An Act for the support of the Civil Government of this Province," and the terms of which were settled by the Imperial Government before its enactment, it was provided among other things, that the Proceeds of all Sales and Leases of Crown Lands, Woods, Mines and Royalties, deducting the expenses of collection, should be paid over to the Provincial Treasury for the use of the Province; and in return therefor, the sum of Fourteen thousand five hundred pounds currency was charged upon all the Revenues of the Province, for the support of the Civil Government; which Act was afterwards made perpetual, and confirmed by Your Most Gracious Majesty in Council.

We would now humbly submit to Your Majesty's consideration, that at the time the said Act was passed, and the Civil List guaranteed in perpetuity, we had no reason to apprehend that the line of Boundary, as then claimed by the British Government, and disputed by the Government of the United States, would be abandoned, whereby a large extent of territorial resources for defraying the Civil List would be lost to this Province.

We need not remind Your Majesty, that throughout the whole of the negotiations with the United States, the Territory in question was claimed by Your Majesty's Government as a part of New Brunswick; nor did we ever learn, that during that protracted dispute, any such claim was made as is now set up by the Canadian Government.

Your Majesty's Government, however, in the exercise of its undoubted power, was pleased to concede to the American Government, by the Treaty of Washington, at least three-fifths of the Territory then in dispute, which embraced by far the most valuable portion thereof, both for Agricultural and Lumbering operations.

We assure Your Majesty, that although the Loyal Inhabitants of this Province were greatly disappointed by the terms of the said Treaty, they were unwilling to complain of a result, however injurious to their interests, seeing that it was confirmed by Your Majesty's Government and approved of by the British Parliament; but when a neighbouring Colony now seeks to deprive us, not only of the residue of the said Territory, but of a large additional portion, the proceeds whereof have been transferred to us by a solemn compact with the Imperial Government, we cannot but complain; and while we lay before Your Gracious Majesty at this time, our protest against the unwarranted encroachments of the Canadian Government and their usurpation of our Territory, we assure Your Majesty that we entertain the most unshaken confidence in Your Royal judgment, and that the result of this our humble and dutiful appeal, will afford the inhabitants of this truly British Province another proof that in the hands of Your Majesty, their rights and interests will ever be protected.

We therefore most humbly and dutifully implore Your Majesty to order the line of Boundary in question to be surveyed and marked out in the terms of the Act of Parliament, commencing at the Bay of Chaleurs, and thence passing along between the Heads of the Rivers that fall into the River Saint Lawrence and those that fall into the Sea, to a point in the Line of Boundary lately established by the Treaty of Washington; and also to secure to this Province the quiet and peaceable possession of the whole of the Territory lying on the Southern side of this line of Boundary, with all the privileges, profits and advantages now arising, or which may hereafter arise from the same.

WILLIAM BLACK,
President Legislative Council.
J. W. WELDON,
Speaker House of Assembly.

From the London Times, Feb. 2.

MR. ADAMS'S SPEECH ON THE OREGON, AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF WAR.

The position which we cited on Friday from Mr. Adams's speech in the House of Representatives is as an argument, more of use to us than to himself, as it shows that in the disputed territory the right of sovereignty has hitherto been intentionally kept in abeyance, and that the United States have no original indefeasible *jus imperii* thereon. It leads to no inference of American rights; it supports no pretensions of American sense. It establishes more evidently than before our own assertion, by an appeal to the actual manner in which the district has been settled, and the light in which that settlement has been regarded by a third party; viz., the aboriginal Indians.

But, however refutable any inference may be which he seeks to deduce from such premises in favour of imperial claims to the Oregon, it will require something more powerful than argument to meet declamatory exhortations to war, and exulting predictions that, in the event of such a contingency, England would lose not only Oregon, but all that she now possesses North of those latitudes. We can easily believe that words of such an import, coming from one who, in addition to the inheritance of a time honoured name, may boast the recollection of long public services and the homage paid to acknowledged merits—we can easily believe that such words, from such a man, will thrill in the hearts of thousands. And indeed to no other cause but an example so authoritative can we attribute the violent and belligerent language which was used by such speakers as Messrs. Ingersoll, Simms, Baker, and McDowell.

Now, we readily admit that in the democratic assembly of a republican state, the temptations to exaggerated or menacing language are very great at all times, and in times of international differences almost irresistible. For this reason we feel great admiration for the intrepidity and true wisdom of those men who, like Messrs. Winthrop and Rhett, have ventured to use the language of moderation and peace in front of a majority clamorous for dissension, and a populace inflated with the visions of conquest. When, waving the question of right either as inconvenient or indifferent, legislators are found teaching the people that it is their destiny to commit a great injustice; that they do not fear the odds of a tussle with Great Britain; that the British Lion has ere now, quailed before the American Eagle, and may soon quail again; that as the power of the Republic has run down south-west as far as Texas and the mines of Potosi, and north-west across the Rocky Mountains to an indefinite extent, and the Columbia, adding state to state and region to region to keep up its balance of power;—when these things are said, repeated, and applauded, the moral courage of those who scout such morality and repudiate such pretensions, cannot be too highly praised or too thankfully acknowledged. They are vindicating the cause of morality and justice in the eyes of Christendom.

But, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, you must be aware that you cannot go on talking thus for ever. Those lips must speak sooner or later the decisive and palpable issue of fact. They must either become utterly nugatory, or else must lead to a war. You cannot escape from this dilemma. It follows from your own speeches and protestations. The representatives of a great people cannot discharge their duty by uttering a torrent of declamations about the "destiny" of their country and the invincible strength of its arms. A cent nuance of such language, not followed by the most vigorous policy, exposes those who speak to some ridicule, and their country to some reproach. Are you, then, prepared to meet the only alternative which is indicated by your own words and shadowed forth by your own predictions? Are you prepared for war? Have you calculated its cost, its consequences, its calamities? Have you reflected on the condition in which it must leave your country?—on the revolution which, be its result what it may, it must work on your political and social systems? Are you prepared or a military aristocracy, perhaps an autocracy?—or standing armies and increased taxation?—for centralization of power round one government, and its fortification by the breastwork of a large military force? Are you prepared for the creation of a new and dominant class?—for the display of oligarchical distinctions, the thirst afte courtly decorations, the overthrow of republican quality? Yet to this end, to these results, so alien from the intentions of your pilgrim fathers, so averse to the spirit of your polity, you are driving your country by your advocacy of warlike measures. Even supposing that in the conflict which you provoke, a success greater than you expect attends your arms—that you plant your victorious standard upon the two banks of the Columbia, or advance it to the shores of Hudson's Straits—that you bat the troops of England and the volunteers of Canada or New Brunswick on every field and in every siege between the two oceans which encompass the Canaan of your vaunted 'destiny'—what will you have gained? The responsibility of a great empire, the invidiousness of detected pretensions, and the domination of some military chief!

But if you fail—if the armies which conquered under Washington retain not their fortune under other leaders—if the pride which has spurned at mediation is chastised in war—if New York is given to plunder, and Washington again holds the English flag floating over her capitol what will you not have lost by the issue of a contest at once unfortunate and unprovoked? In either case will you resume your former position—in neither will you be as you were before the war. You will have created new pretexts of taxation—you will have called into existence new institutions repugnant to your old ones—you will have laid the foundation of future encumbrance, or future despotism. But, more than this, you will have aroused the jealousy, awakened the vigince, and armed the hostility of foreign Powers. You will have forced them to defend themselves against your aggressive, or to punish your defeated efforts. But in the long interval that separates the commencement of a war from its conclusion, what enormities may be practised! what calamities inflicted? Have you thought on these? Have you reckoned their cost, or their guilt? You remember the scenes of 1776; will you re-enact them? You might do us great injury; but your country would suffer dreadfully in the attempt. You might invade our colonies by guerilla detachments, or we should lay our ships of war against the city of your pride and the homesteads of your wealth. You might destroy our merchant vessels, but we should devastate your provinces and despoil your towns. We might lay Washington in ashes; but could you invade England with effect? And we you forgotten the sacred danger which you hold in your bosom? Can you forget that to the horrors of a foreign war would be added the great horrors of a civil war?—a war not of lines, columns, or camps, but a war waged against heads of families and houses, by ambuscade, and every species of treachery complicated with every kind of cruelty; a vengeance could devise and opportunity provoke. Again, do you remember that a war with England could not be a little war, nor confined to two states; that it would light up the world in its conflagration, and add to the cruelty of an unnatural contest the inconvenience of unnatural or faithless alliance? You rely on France, and forget Russia. But do you forget the traditionary fickleness of the former, and the anti-democratic mission of the latter? Do you not know these things? Do you not fear them? We seek not to intimidate you with vain menaces and unreal bugbears. But we did you as patriots who love your country, as statesmen who are legislating for future times, above all, as men who profess to adore justice and to serve truth—we bid you pause, and reckon the fearful risk which you are running, and the monstrous misery which you are courting.

The Oregon Debate in the Senate.—The N. Y. Courier and Enquirer, in commenting on the lack of historical knowledge of some of the members of the Senate, speaks thus of Senator Allen, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In a passage purporting to recite *historically* the incidents of Bonaparte's menaced invasion of England, we find these statements made by Mr. A.:—

"Her strength (meaning England) against a continental invasion was to be found in a line of water 24 miles wide. Well, sir; a great man appeared in the world, and put himself at the head of an insurgent mass of the French nation. You know his history. Among the things that he did was to take it as the axiom of his whole policy to curtail the colossal monopoly and ascendency of Great Britain. It would be doing others injustice, however, to say that he originated that policy. It was the same substance that was embraced in the Berlin edict which passed before the time of Bonaparte."

Is not this sublime in the Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Relations of the Senate of the U. S.? The Berlin edict passed before the time of Bonaparte. And this from one professing to be an American statesman, about a decree, which, on the part of France, began that career of insult and wrong to neutral rights, and especially to the rights, and commerce of the United States, that occupied so much attention—underwent such elaborate discussion at the hands of some of our ablest diplomatists and writers, and came so near plunging us into a war with France.

The Berlin decree was dated 21st November, 1806, from the capital of the King of Prussia, then occupied by the Emperor Napoleon at the head of his victorious troops, after the overwhelming overthrow of the whole Prussian army at *Jena*, and the successive combats that followed it within a few days. Napoleon had been nearly two years Emperor of the French.

Mr. Hannegan, who took the same side with Mr. Allen, but talked with more decorum, was not more fortunate in concealing ignorance, and that too of the Oregon subject under discussion.

THE OBSERVER.

ST. JOHN, TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1846

THE OREGON CONVENTION AND THE NOTICE.—A debate of some interest arose in the U. S. Senate on the 26th ult., on the subject of the long discussed notice, for terminating the Oregon Convention. The question, immediately before the Senate, was the order of proceeding upon the several propositions and amendments on this subject.—The following form of notice was proposed by Mr. Colquitt, of Georgia, in amendment of the resolves from the House of Representatives:—

1. That notice be given, in terms of the Treaty, for abrogating the convention made between Great Britain and the United States, on the 20th October, 1818, and continued by the convention of 1827, immediately after the close of the present session of Congress, unless the President, in his discretion, shall consider it expedient to defer it to a later period.

2. And be it further resolved, That it is earnestly desired that the long standing controversy respecting limits in the Oregon territory be settled by negotiation and compromise, in order to tranquillize the public mind, and to preserve the friendly relations between the two countries.

Should these resolutions be adopted, it is surmised that Mr. Buchanan will retire from the Cabinet, and negotiations be renewed.—Mr. Webster thought that the Senate was approaching the time when it would be proper to express an opinion on this subject, if it intended to express any, for there was an extreme inconvenience to the public, resulting from the present posture of affairs.

We subjoin the Speeches of several of the *moderate* men in the Senate, who oppose the "all or nothing" doctrine, and are in favour of equitable negotiation and compromise:—

Mr. Crittenden said that he had examined the amendment suggested by Mr. Colquitt, and he saw no objection to adopting that part of it, which was a mere modification of the form of his own; but it embraced a second proposition, which presented another question, in which he did not entirely concur. He proceeded to say that he did not conceive there was any need of haste in the decision of the question, as the notice would not be given until after the close of the session.

The subject, meanwhile, remained open to diplomatic negotiation between this and the British Government. Those who conducted the foreign relations of the Government had this duty in their hands, and they were personally responsible to the nation for the right exercise of the weighty power which had been entrusted to their hands. To that responsibility he would hold them—to that responsibility they would be held by the united judgment of the whole world. The eyes of all Christendom were fastened upon them, and every civilized nation on the earth would hold them to the responsibilities of peace or war. For one, Mr. C. was not disposed to relax or to diminish this responsibility one jot. If the Administration felt the greatness of its position, let it feel also the responsibility which is attached to it. Those who should involve this country in an unjust or in a needless war, must encounter a responsibility weight enough to sink a navy. Let them beware. To defend the national rights was one thing; to rush needlessly into war was quite another. To protect the vital interests of this country was their solemn duty, and of those interests peace was the greatest and the mightiest. The duties were not inconsistent; but let them not act in a vaunting spirit; let us have no fanaticism in politics. Considerations more profound—considerations of a higher and nobler sort should actuate those entrusted with a nation's destiny. No hasty expressions passing between two negotiators—no pouting or strutting upon the stage, could justify the getting two such nations into a state of war. No, said Mr. C. we the people of the United States take a different view of the matter. We feel no need of going to war to make a character—we have a character. We are not obliged to set up idle and extravagant pretensions, or utter the language of inflated boasting, to make the world believe we are a brave people, and will not yield our rights. This has ever been too much the disposition of Republics. We have a just title to Oregon—a title just geographically and politically—and this was enough without any boasting. A silent and dignified course is more worthy of ourselves and of our cause.—In the conscious power of vindicating our rights, whenever they should be attempted to be assailed, we are under no necessity of vilifying the character of others.

He concurred with the honorable Senator from Missouri (Mr. Benton) that it would be most proper for the Senate to act on the resolutions sent from the House of Representatives, to make such amendments or alterations in them as to them might seem necessary and proper, and then send them back to the other branch of the Legislature. He was desirous to show, before our own people and before the world, a decided disposition to preserve peace, and he was prepared to go to the full extent of their constitutional power honorably to secure that end. It was not their duty to seek a war, and for one he was willing and most anxious that the peace of the country should be properly and honorably preserved, and this vexed question brought to a final settlement. Let this be done by negotiation by arbitration, or some of those modes recognised as fit and becoming to settle the differences of nations, without recurrence to the sword.

And here Mr. C. could not forbear to express his regret at the rejection by the Executive department of the offers of arbitration, which had been made to it by the representative of the British Government.—He had no wish improperly to interfere with those whose province it was to conduct the foreign affairs of the country, but he could not conceive what right we had to place ourselves in this respect above all who had gone before us, and above all the other nations of the world, by declaring that our disputes never should be submitted to arbitration—that, however other nations might agree to settle their differences, we never would condescend to make an umpire of any body, and that the rights of boundary were not in themselves a fit subject for arbitration.

This doctrine was pure interpolation into the code of international law—a code on which all the world had agreed, and which we, as one of the nations of the world, had adopted. The choice of an arbitrator was another matter; we might reject in that capacity the proposal of any crowned head. Crowned heads were not always the wisest and best in this world; but there were other modes of arbitration, and other more suitable arbitrators. There were men who were born private citizens, and not princes, who, by their wisdom, their knowledge, their experience, and their personal virtues were fitted to be a judging power, whose decision no nation need be ashamed to submit to. Why not refer the settlement of this controverted question to such a tribunal? To do so, instead of degrading us, would, in his estimation, be one of the noblest tributes that ever could be offered to the wisdom and excellence of republican institutions. For a great and powerful nation voluntarily to submit a great question, touching its rights and interests, to an assemblage of private citizens thus virtuous and wise, would present a spectacle glorious to behold. It would be to present to the world convincing evidence of the moral progress and intellectual elevation of the age. It would stamp upon the present century a character as wonderful for its advances and improvement in political wisdom, as for its inventions in the mechanic arts, and its achievements in chaining the discoveries of science to the car of social prosperity and happiness. Such a triumph of moderation over passion, of justice over pride, and of the glory of reason over the brutality of mere physical force, proceeding from republican hands, would do more for the moral power and influence of this country than the acquisition of every inch of Oregon. This would raise our reputation in the estimation of all the good and wise; it would obtain us a revenue of national honour—that brightest jewel in a nation's treasury—and would augment our real power among the civilized population of the globe more than the acquisition of ten times the disputed territory.

These were Mr. C.'s sentiments. He could perceive no occasion for bluster or for rashness. Our character as a people was well enough known, and he hoped that the Senate would proceed in this matter temperately, wisely, justly, and in order. When it had done this, Mr. C. felt inclined to rely on the hope that the conduct of other nations would correspond to such an example.

Mr. Webster said—The Senator from Kentucky, in one part of his speech, says that he will leave the entire responsibility of this whole controversy where the Constitution has placed it, and contends that those who have the power to conduct the foreign diplomacy of the country are responsible to the country and to the world for the manner in which they shall exercise that power. This is certainly very just, but it raises a doubt whether we ought to do more than simply to give, or to refuse to give, the naked notice. But some modification of the mere naked notice has been made already in the other House; and there is, as I believe, a conviction on the part of a large majority of the Senate that it should, to a certain extent, be qualified. Now, I hold that, under these circumstances, we have a right to know in what point of view the Executive himself regards this notice; what are the ends he has in view, and what are the consequences to which, in the judgment of the Executive, the notice is to lead.

When speaking on this subject some six weeks ago, I said it was most obvious that the President could not expect war; because he did not act as the Chief Magistrate of such a nation should be expected to act, if charged as he was with the defence of the country, he expected any danger of its being assaulted by the most formidable Power upon earth. I still say there is nothing in the Executive communications to show us that the President does expect a war. He must, then, expect nothing but a continuance of the present dispute, or a settlement of it by negotiation. But how is it to be settled? On what terms? On what basis? All that we hear is, "the whole of Oregon or none!" And yet there is to be negotiation. We cannot conceal from ourselves or the world the gross inconsistency of such conduct. It is the spirit of the whole negotiation, on our part, that Oregon is ours; there is nothing like admitting even a doubt, on the part of ourselves, as to that position; and yet we are to negotiate! What is negotiation? Does any gentleman expect that the Administration are, by negotiation, to pursuade Great Britain to surrender the whole of what she holds in Oregon? They *may* do this; I cannot say they will not. If that is their expectation, let them try their hand at it; I wish them success. That is, I wish that we may get "all Oregon," if we can; but let our argument be fair, and let us settle the question reasonably.

But I do not understand the position we are placed in. The Executive seems to be for negotiation, but against taking any thing but the *whole* of Oregon.—What is to be the ground of negotiation? What is the basis on which it is to proceed? If the Executive has made up his mind not to treat for less than the whole, he should say so, and throw himself at once on the two Houses of Congress.

I cannot much longer be quiet in the existing posture of affairs: when no measures of defence are recommended to us, but negotiation is held out as likely to bring the question to a settlement by England's giving up the whole matter in dispute. My doubt of that is as strong as that expressed by the Senator from Michigan, (Mr. Cass). I say here, so far as my own knowledge goes, that it is not the judgment of this country, that it is not the judgment of this Senate, that the government of the United States shall run the hazard of a war for Oregon, by renouncing as no longer fit for consideration propositions made by ourselves to Great Britain thirty years ago, and repeated again and again before the world.

I am willing to try the question to-day, this hour, this minute; I am ready now to take the question whether this difficulty shall or shall not be settled by compromise. Compromise I can understand; but negotiation, with a fixed resolution to take, and *not to give*, with a predetermination *not to take less than the whole*, is what I do not and cannot understand in diplomacy. I wish we could take the question now—not for the purpose of giving information in any quarter, but I wish to put an end to the present distressing, distracting, annoying state of things. There are many things we should attend to, all of which are greatly and materially embarrassed by the present position of this affair. It is proposed, for example, to remodel the tariff. But with what view? To augment revenue, or reduce revenue? If it is to augment the revenue, then I ask, is that with a view to war? If it is to reduce revenue, then I ask, is that with a view to peace? How can we possibly know how to act, without the least knowledge whether there is a likelihood of the continuance of peace, or whether we are on the eve of an outbreaking war. The embarrassment in the private affairs of men is equally pressing. The nation possesses a great commerce. Now it is easy for a gentleman to say, "I disregard commerce on a question of the national honor." So do I, when that is the question. If the honor of my country is attacked, I will say, in the memorable language once used by a member of the other House, "Perish commerce!" But these are interests not to be trifled with. Those great interests of this country, in which are involved the daily bread of thousands and millions of men, are not to be put in jeopardy for objects not connected in reality either with the honor or the substantial interests of the country. I wish, therefore, so soon as it is practicable, to obtain an expression of the opinion of the Senate. It is small be the opinion of this body that it is best, that, from the effects of a fall from the outside states to give the naked notice recommended in the Executive message, that will throw the responsibility upon the Executive to the fullest extent. I am for getting a question either on the naked notice, or on notice in some modified form, such as shall express what I believe to be the judgment both of the Senate and of the country.

Mr. Calhoun rose and said, it is very obvious that the great question involved in this matter is this: Can the controversy between us and Great Britain be settled by negotiation and compromise? or is it to be settled by an assertion of our right to the entire territory, and an appeal to arms? Whatever doubts have heretofore existed on this point, there can be none after the declaration of to-day, that this is the real question involved. A question of greater moment never has been presented in Congress from the days of the revolution to the present. Sir, I hold it eminently desirable that the Senate should make an express on of their opinion upon this important matter. I cannot believe that there is a single Senator who has not made up his mind upon it, or who can hesitate to respond yea or nay, when the question is put in the form of an amendment to the resolution. Sir, I hold it important that they should respond. It is necessary to know the sense of this body, in order to guide our future legislation. If we mean to maintain our title by force of arms, let us begin, let us lay aside all other things; and let me say, if gentlemen do not begin with the necessary measures before involving the country in a war, you are most likely to be discomfited; and foremost among those important measures are those relating to your finances. Sir, I hold it be desirable to guide the business men of the country. They know not what to do, nor have they known for the last three months. The property of thousands has been periled, and millions upon millions have been lost. Sir, there ought to be an end to this state of excitement. With due deference to the Executive, and without intending the slightest disrespect, I must say I greatly regret that it has been left in the state of uncertainty it has. Sir, I deem it to be important, and I speak without hesitation on this point, that it should be passed this very day; because, whatever our decision is, it is desirable in my opinion that it should reach the other side of the Atlantic as speedily as possible.

Sir, I believed, from the beginning of the session, that the great question of peace or war depended upon this body—upon your gravity, your wisdom, and your patriotism; and I trust that such a response will be given *this very day* as will quiet the fears of millions on both sides of the Atlantic.

Mr. Pendleton, of Virginia, said—It is vain for gentlemen to say, that "it is a provision of the convention of 1818 that either party should give notice when it chooses, and therefore it is the first, and a peaceable step towards a settlement." Had either party given notice to the other (and given it in advance of any attempt at negotiation) that the joint occupancy was to cease; then, sir, it was a regular, peaceful and proper measure. It would have been in that case the first step towards the settlement of a long postponed question. The next step would of course have been negotiation, which would have brought the matter to an amicable adjustment, or to the arbitrament of arms.

But here, sir, is altogether a different state of things. The notice now proposed, is not that provided for or contemplated and provided for in the convention of 1818—That notice was intended as a means in the hands of either party, of bringing on, when it saw fit, a negotiation to settle the points in dispute. But in this case, the parties waived the formality of notice, and proceeded to actual negotiation. The President of the United States has seen fit to break it off abruptly—without exhausting the usual and ordinary means of adjusting international questions of territory and boundary. He declares to us that no long continuance can be effected. He precludes the whole transaction, as if to cut off the possibility of retreat from both parties; and calls upon us for co-operation. The difference is too manifest, not to be seen and comprehended by the feeblest understanding.

The import of notice, if now given by authority of Congress, is nothing more nor less than war. We back the President at all hazards; we concur with him in the opinion that you do not mean to do what is right; we will not allow you a single inch of this territory; we will proceed at the end of twelve months to take possession of the whole country, as well your present establishments there, as the rest; we have no proposition for peaceful adjustment to offer, but we will make good our claim to some other means than compromise or arbitration. Do we represent to Great Britain the single and only alternative of war or submission? Sir, there is not a little page upon your floor that does not see that. Then I ask, can any man who knows any thing of England, suppose that she will submit to so harsh a treatment? To say nothing of the injury, did she ever submit to so much insult, from any Power, or from any combination of Powers? She says it is injury—all the world must pronounce it insult.

In these, then, in the present circumstances—her credit, her army, her navy, her resources of every kind—any thing to make her fear the hazards of war, more than in ordinary circumstances, and at all times? Her army is stronger than, on a peace establishment, it ever was before; her naval power infinitely greater than when single-handed she swept the combined fleets of the other principal naval powers from every sea. Her credit is equal to the command of every dollar in Europe. She is at peace with all the world. She has the prospect of allances on our own continent, in consequence of the relations which the wisdom of "progressive democracy" has established between ourselves and Mexico; and, if we are to confide in the judgment of those gentlemen here, who seem disposed to take the management of the whole business in their hands, she has the sympathy of all the crowned heads with her.

I must say, that, in my poor opinion, England cannot—and that, with a proper and prudent regard for her own public character and moral influence with the world at large, and especially within her own possessions, she *dare* not—submit to it. If she does, then she pocketsan affront grosser than any to which she has submitted for eight hundred years past; and she does so precisely at the time when she is more able than at any other period of her existence, to resist and resent it. He was against the notice at present, except in a modified form.

Washington's Farewell advice to his People.—Neilson's Quebec Gazette says: "There has been a time when we thought it possible that the people of the United States might adhere to the following recommendation of WASHINGTON on his retiring from public life, on the 17th September, 1797. The recent conduct of some of their public men and the representative bodies, of the choice of the majority of the people, has done much to shake our faith in their finally giving the "magnanimous and novel example" which was the hope of GEORGE WASHINGTON, and good men of all countries:—

"Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened and (at no distant period) a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."—[WASHINGTON'S Farewell Address.]

MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.—Last evening, the Rev. J. C. Galloway, A. M., delivered to a densely crowded house, an instructive lecture on *Palestine*. After an introduction, in which he mentioned several grounds, on which Palestine should be considered the most interesting of all lands on the face of the earth, the Rev. lecturer stated that he had at