

other branch of the loose from the restrictions of the treaty, by to pass, and to being the notice conformably to its second aration of war. Its, and then we can legislate for the protec- ture of a territory, of our people, and the advancement of the eers made by one nests of the country. Such are my views on a branch of the subject. And while I do

Mr. Peel replied :

the adoption of the House of Representatives of the 28th Con- I will not discuss—while I totally repudiate the idea of com- when, as I have said, my opinions to the opinions of the Pre- as signified to us its ent, or any one else—yet, sir, in the fear that, to effect a satisfactory of the Oregon ter- persisting, we might fail to accomplish any- of the executive gis, and with a view to concentrate the op- believe that it will gesmen and people, and, if possible, to avoid measure at varian or, I am willing to yield for the present the n the opinions the utable features of the territorial bill, until we own statesmen en a abrogate the treaty entirely. Let us then discussion in the Se re the notice, and pass the best bill we can for \$43, on a bill kno efficient protection of our citizens; one in n said : high all reasonable men can unite as being in that the present m not conformity to the treaty; and when the at the recent molve months expire, we can do the rest. n the spirit of peace I have another extract from Mr. Calhoun's which exhibited great uch in support of these views, which I had ration in the migotten to read at an earlier stage of my re- fore more to be marks, but which I beg the indulgence of the resist if we should committee for permission to read at this time :

“Mr. Calhoun said: But if our finances were in or so flourishing a state; if the political condi- Mr. Calhoun further of the country were as strong as it could be opinion that Great de by an administration standing at the head against us. If I be a powerful dominant party; and if our popula- tion at this time on had reached the point where we could suc- cessfully assert and maintain our claim against the ably consider the ers’ claim of Great Britain, there would still session adverse to us remain a decisive objection to this bill. The mode at least of the Co which it proposes to do it is indefensible. If e same time, take re are displeased with the existing arrangement y a strong fortifi which leaves the territory free and open to the garrison, and leav citizens and subjects of the two countries; if we shall acquiesce, or the opinion it operates practically to our edge her. To acqu advantage, or that the time has arrived when To negotiate wif exclusive sovereignty over the territory, the sion against us. w treaty provides expressly for the case. It author- o dislodge her at nos either party, by giving a year’s notice. To ter- own, be impractic- minate its existence whenever it pleases, and ould be the proba without giving reasons. Why has not this bill assed.” conformed to this express and plain provision?—

Why should it undertake to assert our exclusive ownership to the whole territory, in direct viola- tion of the treaty? Why should it, with what we all believe to be a good title on our part, in- volve the country in a controversy about the vio- lation of the treaty in which a large portion, if not a majority, of the body believe that we would be in the wrong, when the treaty itself might so easily and in so short a time be terminated by our own act, and the charge of its violation be avoided? Can any satisfactory reason be given to these questions? I ask the author of the measure and its advocates for an answer. None has been given yet, and none, I venture to assert, will be attempted. I can imagine but one answer that can be given—that there are those who will vote for the bill that would not vote to give the notice, under the delusive hope that we may assert our

exclusive ownership, and take possession, without violating the treaty or endangering the peace of the country. Their aim is to have all the benefit of the treaty without being subject to its restrictions—an aim in direct conflict with the only object of the treaty—to prevent conflict between the two countries, by keeping the question of ownership or sovereignty in abeyance till the question of boundary can be settled.”

We are now told, if we give the notice, we will involve the country in war; and some have gone so far as to call the notice a war measure, and its friends the war party. We have heard much in this debate about a peace and a war party. I presume, Mr. Chairman, no one believes there is a party in Congress in favor of war “for war’s sake,” merely for the purpose of having a fight. There is no such party here.—If gentlemen mean by the “war party” to designate those who prefer war to an *inglorious peace*, they are correct; there is such a party in Congress, and a much larger one in the country.

The country has grown tired of this frequent cry of war; it fails to alarm or excite the people; even the timid have become familiar with it, as a sort of “household word,” and are unmoved by it. If, therefore, it is in any way intended to frighten them from their course, to force them into a false position, to induce them to oppose the giving of the notice, it is wholly unavailing, and had better be abandoned. If gentlemen want to keep the country out of a war, they must satisfy the people that it would be for some cause, in the particular case, dishonorable or unnecessary; but never appeal to their fears. Don’t underrate the strength of your own country, and overrate that of our adversary. Do not tell them that they would be whipped, for they will not be made to realize it. By such arguments you but inflame their passions; they know they cannot be vanquished by any nation on earth; and if they but believe their cause is just, they feel doubly armed. I have the charity to believe that no *respectable* member of this committee would intentionally and without cause, involve the country in an unnecessary or dishonorable war; we are all for peace, but differ as to the best means of preserving it.

In the extract I have just read, Mr. Calhoun did not consider the notice a war measure, but the reverse. He urged it upon the consideration of the Senate as a first step for our government, a sort of preliminary to the further action of Congress upon the subject; not as a war, but as a peace policy. He said, and said truly, that the treaty provided expressly for it, and that we had a right to give it without assigning our reasons. He characterized the hope, as vain and delusive, that we could avail ourselves of the benefits of that treaty without subjecting ourselves to its restrictions. I endorse and adopt his opinions as then expressed, as to the peaceful character of the notice. None of us know, or can know in advance, whether it will or will not produce war. We have our opinions, and I