

President saw did cut off all icably, within he is anxious ritish subjects lled from the n to do while e citizens of y; and while n for an ami- Do not gentle- ly the least of a we calculate n interrupting eciate the irri- ill wou. I prot- et us suppos s she had the abrogation of nent had pass- citizens were ry: is there a erican citizen an American ts as equiva- one, I would th her under- once to meet s. I do not r, whether he t, under such- tiation.

the measures mitted to the aether, at their- expiration of- sures may be- tion of 1827, e government- region. That- pper to make s there, I am

recommenda- n to the exer- n legislation, t, with an eye- stipulations. ent says,) in n, and I trust- by the Uni- nendations, I nem all most- proper, and- obligations,- urse of ami- o recommenda- o go; and for

the President ther this bill e recommenda- s he can say- obligations- tled "A bill- tters in the- tention of the- will vote for- but the first- the Oregon

territory, "provided that it shall not be construed nor executed in such a manner as to deprive the subjects of Great Britain of any of the rights and privileges secured to them by the treaty of 1827 with the United States, until the said treaty stipulations shall cease by virtue of the notice provided for in the second article of the treaty."

The very first section extends the law over British subjects after the twelve months; thus it violates the title of the bill, and the treaty obligations which the President so earnestly recommends us to hold sacred. I was pleased to see my colleague [Mr. Houston] move an amendment to avoid this objection, (as he no doubt intended it to do, but which would not have that effect,) to strike out of the bill the latter clause of the first section, in these words: "until said treaty stipulations shall cease by virtue of the notice provided for in the second article of said last mentioned treaty," and so prevent the operation of the law on the British subjects, as well after the expiration of twelve months as before. But inasmuch as no treaty stipulations will exist after the twelve months notice is given, the proviso in the section would have nothing to operate upon, and the section would apply to British subjects as well with my colleague's amendment as without it. As my colleague intended his amendment to limit the operation of the bill to the term of joint occupancy, and as he must see that it will not effect his object, he cannot object to such an alteration of it as will accomplish what he designed.

Mr. Houston explained that his colleague did not understand him correctly. His object was so to frame the bill as for it to say nothing about the termination of the joint convention. Let it go into operation as a law of the land, and so continue until it may be superseded by other legislation. He did not propose to limit it to the abrogation of the treaty; but while he would not consent to legislate now for the state of things which may exist after that time, he would also refuse to limit the operation of this bill, leaving it to be superseded by subsequent legislation.

Mr. Chapman continued. I would not do my colleague injustice. I will not state what he said to me and other colleagues [Messrs. DARGAN and YANCEY] at the time; but I will state what he is reported to have said in the paper (the Union) to which I referred.

Mr. Chapman then read from the Union of the 13th of April, as follows:

"Mr. G. S. Houston moved to amend the first section of the bill by striking out the following words from the end thereof:

"Until said treaty stipulations shall cease by virtue of the notice provided for in the second article in said last-mentioned treaty."

"Mr. G. S. Houston advocated the amendment which he had proposed. At the end of the year the subject could be legislated upon. It was unnecessary to make any provision in advance."

The object of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, could not have been more clearly expressed than it is in this report of my colleague's remarks. It was to limit the operation of the bill to our own subjects in Oregon and to the time of joint occupancy.

Mr. Houston again interposed, and said he desired to understand his colleague. He did not understand him when he says he will not repeat

the conversation which I had with him or with others of my colleagues. Now, he certainly knows that a remark of that sort is calculated to create improper impressions, much more so than if he were to repeat any conversations I may have had with him. I do not now remember what I may have said to him; but I state to my colleague and to the committee, that I said nothing to him in private or to any of my colleagues which is inconsistent with the position I have assumed now and previously.

Mr. Chapman. I understood my colleague, then, as he was reported—that is, that he wanted to limit the bill to the joint occupancy. So did others understand him.

Mr. Houston said he had not read his remarks as reported, nor did he generally read the reports. But he found that his remarks were correctly reported: that when the time came for the expiration of the treaty, they all contemplated further legislation, and knew it to be necessary. He did not mean to say that this bill would absolutely expire then, but simply that it would be suspended by further legislation.

Mr. Chapman. I take the gentleman by what he says himself as reported; he admits that he is correctly reported, and it is not likely that he is misreported, as he sits within a few feet of the reporters. I have said that I was gratified when my colleague moved his amendment with the avowed purpose of limiting the operation of the bill to our own citizens—to the time of the joint occupancy—to conform the bill to its title. I regret now to learn from him that his object was not as I supposed, not as declared by him at the time to me to be his object. Then, what object had he in offering the amendment? I have shown that it would not change the bill in any way—that its operation would be the same with the amendment as without it. The amendment would render the bill more objectionable in this: that it serves to conceal, what without it is avowed. The title of the bill is calculated, as I have shown, to mislead us as to its object; the first section goes beyond the title. My colleague's amendment only serves still to keep up the deception, although I am sure he would not intentionally practice such a deception. I will not believe for a moment that the committee who reported this bill intended to practice any deception upon the House by giving it a false title; much less will I suppose that, in adding the tail which my colleague proposes to cut off, they acted as a horse jockey who puts on the price of his horse ten dollars in addition, to full, if it becomes necessary, in order to effect a sale. But I will say, that the bill ought to conform to its title, especially in so important a particular. Bills are often read here by their titles, and sometimes passed by their titles, without further examination. The first section of the bill, then, is highly objectionable: first, because it extends our laws over British subjects, after the twelve months' notice, in violation of our treaty stipulations; because it holds out a threat to Great Britain that we shall take possession of the whole territory, when we have, for nearly half a century, recognised her joint right to occupy it. Such a measure at this time, following the notice we have authorized, will, in my judgment, seriously embarrass the President in his efforts to settle the difficulty by negotiation, if it does not bring