

Lumber river certainly must run through his district. [A laugh.]

MR. LOCKEY. The gentleman mistakes the nature of my patriotism. He thinks that a man's patriotism must be confined to his own district. Now, I am willing to improve North Carolina in any part of it; and just so I feel in regard to the United States.

MR. KING resumed. I am happy to hear of the gentleman's patriotism, and I shall be still more so, if, when it comes to the vote, he shall show that his patriotism, which has already reached Lumber river, is found sufficiently expanded to extend to Oregon! I hope that we shall look on this as a great national question. My feelings are with the South—my destiny is with hers; but I will suffer no local or sectional views to influence my course on this important measure. It was with extreme reluctance that I heard the remark made by a member on this floor, that whatever might be the fate of this question, he should have the consolation to know that he had not followed in the lead of the gentleman from Massachusetts. [MR. ADAMS.] I regret that it should be thought necessary to invoke existing prejudices against an individual to operate against a great national measure.

But, sir, in reply to that remark, I might, with equal propriety, say that we who support the notice will have the consolation to know that we are not following in the lead of Great Britain. But such a declaration would not be an argument for or against the notice. It has been said that the member from Ohio [MR. GIMBRETT] is for the notice, and that he is actuated by motives unworthy of a statesman. But even this shall not deter me from giving my vote for a measure which I believe to be right. I might as well be told, because one of the chosen twelve was a traitor and betrayed the Savior, that therefore I must reject Christianity. I follow in the lead of no man. I go for my country. We are told that we must not act lest a war ensue. Has it come to this that our government can carry out no important measure connected with her domestic or foreign policy without the cry of war being raised and held up as a terror over us? War and ruin panics have alternately prevailed ever since the commencement of our government, and if we wait for them to cease before we act we shall never do anything. If we attempt to procure indemnity for spoliation on the property of our citizens by a foreign country, the war cry is raised!—if we attempt to annex Texas, war in all its horrors is depicted as the consequence!—and when we attempt to assert our claim to Oregon, we are told an unjust and sanguinary war will be inevitable! The horrors of war have been described in so vivid and forcible a manner that one might almost imagine that they saw the British steamers darting from point to point along our coast—that they heard the thundering of British cannon, and beheld our cities with their temples of justice and their temples of religion wrapt in flames! But in the midst of this gloomy picture, the reflection rises in my mind, that whatever may have been the devastating effects of past wars, it is nevertheless certain a portion of mankind are so constituted that they grieve much about wars that never happen; and such, I hope, is the character of the lamentations of the gentlemen we have heard on this occasion. I am for peace, I love peace; I appreciate its effects upon commerce; and, above all, I admire its happy influences in a moral and political point of view. But while I say

this, I must be permitted to remark, that I would scorn the idea of a peace that had to be purchased at the sacrifice of the interests and the honor of my country. The territory claimed by Great Britain on this continent, is greater in extent than our own, with Oregon included; and ought we to surrender to that government any portion of our soil? No, sir, we have none to spare. It has been with deep regret that I have heard remarks on this floor more disparaging to our claim to Oregon than anything that I have ever seen in the correspondence of the British minister himself. It has always been unfortunate for this country that in all of her controversies with foreign governments, sentiments have been uttered here which were calculated to mislead other countries in relation to the state of public opinion in the United States, and thereby to render the subject of dispute the more difficult to adjust. Such, I fear, will be the case in the present controversy. Sir, it is time we had learned to stand on our own feet. Great Britain is, year after year, by the force of her diplomacy, and the power of her sword, bringing our nation after nation to bow to power and dominion, until her possessions dot your map over a considerable portion of the globe. With our love of liberty, we could not withhold our sympathy from those whose misfortune it has been, from time to time, to fall within her grasp; but we have stood by and beheld all these things in silence, adhering to the policy not to interfere in foreign disputes in which our own safety does not require us to take part. But when she comes upon our own shores, and seeks to possess herself of a part of our territory, every consideration of interest and of patriotism requires that we should resist her arrogant demands in the spirit of freemen who know their rights, and dare maintain them. If the preservation of our rights did not require it, such a course would then be absolutely necessary even to command the respect of Great Britain herself. In all the pictures that have been drawn of the horrid results of war, gentlemen have taken it for granted that we are to bear all the loss and make all the sacrifices, and that Great Britain has nothing to lose. But such is not the fact. Disastrous as such a conflict might prove to us, she has more to fear from it than ourselves. She cannot but foresee that the prosecution of a war against the United States would lead to a dismemberment of nearly all of her colonial possessions, and, perhaps, ultimately to an entire dissolution of her form of government. She has her domestic feuds and her immense debt; she has a commerce to suffer as well as ourselves; and the loss of our trade will injure her more than the loss of her trade can injure us. The defenceless condition of the United States has been frequently alluded to; and the gentleman from Alabama [MR. YANCY] said that there were perhaps no United States soldiers in his own State at this time. I learned almost my first lesson on this Oregon question from that noble State. At the last session of Congress she sent to this House a resolution, passed by her legislature, in the following words:

*Resolved, That the true policy of the United States requires that the joint occupancy of Oregon by the United States and England should cease; and resolved, that the title of the United States to the territory of Oregon is clear and indisputable.*

This was the language of that gallant State one year ago. But, sir, Alabama has soldiers—citizen soldiers—the best in the world. Let a British soldier set his foot on Alabama's consecrated soil, and