

appears to his Majesty's Government that it would be *necessary to adopt these seven decisions of the arbiter as a groundwork for further proceedings*; and it seems that *no satisfactory or useful result could be obtained from the local survey proposed by the American Government, until the two parties are agreed upon these seven points.*"

Now I ask the House to look at this proposition in all its naked deformity, and then to say, whether a proposition of a more *insulting* character could be made. A case is submitted to an arbiter, to wit: to settle a boundary line *according to the terms of a treaty*. He, pretending to find great difficulties in his way, declines *deciding*, setting forth his views at large in a report, and closing with his *advice* to the parties, to adjust the dispute in a particular way, utterly at variance with the terms of the treaty. But, as the arbiter had travelled out of his commission, had *advised* merely, when by accepting the papers he had agreed to *decide*, and had confounded "*highlands*" with the *bed of a river*, the award is rejected and set aside as of no validity or effect.

Some years afterwards, when another attempt is made to settle the difficulty, one of the parties hunts up the old report of the arbiter, and endeavors to show that the arbiter, *arguendo* at least, had decided seven points subsidiary to the main question, which he did not decide, and *insists* that these seven points shall be made the "*groundwork for further proceedings*," in effect, insisting on a right to pick out of the award all that they consider as particularly favorable to themselves, and throwing the rest away! Now I ask, what can be more insulting than this? I ask if the history of diplomacy can show its parallel, and if we are willing to submit to this degradation any longer? But this is not all. In a letter of Mr. Vaughan to Mr. Forsyth, dated December 8, 1834, he says: "His Majesty's Government trust that the American Cabinet will be prepared to agree with that of his Majesty as to the construction to be put upon this passage of the treaty, and will concur in deciding that the Atlantic rivers which are to guide the commissioners in searching for the highlands described in the treaty, are those rivers which fall into the sea to the westward of the mouth of the river *St. Croix*." That is, the St. Johns and Ristigouche are not Atlantic rivers; and he adds: "The undersigned is instructed to represent to Mr. Forsyth that his Majesty's Government consider a *clear agreement* between the two Governments on this point to be an *indisputable preliminary* to the establishment of any new commission of survey." And subsequently, he says, after alluding to the arbitration of the King of the Netherlands, the British Government "*cannot now consent to refer it to any other arbitration.*"

Here we have it, in express terms, that the British Government will not submit the matter to *arbitration* at any rate, and will not consent even to have a survey, unless we will agree to their "*indisputable preliminary*," to wit: that the St. Johns and Ristigouche are not Atlantic rivers; that is, they will not consent to enter upon a course to ascertain the line, unless we will first *admit* that *we have no case*; for I regard the acknowledgment that the St. Johns and Ristigouche are not Atlantic rivers, as equivalent to it. But, to cap the climax in this series of insulting propositions, let me quote once more from the letter of Mr. Bankhead to Mr. Forsyth, dated December 28, 1835. "His Majesty's

Government, however, do not the less lament that the advances which they have made have been fruitless; but with their regret is mingled the satisfactory consciousness which they feel, that, in making those advances, they have gone to the *utmost extent* to which a due regard to the honor and interests of the British Crown could permit them to go." *Honor and interests of the British Crown!* What sort of honor is that which unblushingly and wantonly refuses to abide by the solemn stipulations of a treaty? But they have a "satisfactory consciousness" in contemplating the "*advances*" they have made. "*Advances!*" What advances have they made, but to advance *upon our territory*, and then insisting upon our agreeing that they are right, before they will consent to inquire into the legality of such an advance. They have, to be sure, made "*advances*," but they are upon our patience and good nature; they are a wanton trampling upon our rights.

But, sir, I will not occupy the time of the House longer with this branch of the subject. I have not read all from the correspondence bearing upon the point I have been considering, lest I should fatigue the House; but only enough to show that it is utterly "*hopeless*," as the British Government say, to expect any thing further from invitations on our part to protract this correspondence; and I think every member who has listened to me must be satisfied of that. What, then, shall be done? Shall Great Britain be permitted to remain in the quiet and undisturbed possession and use of our property, without making one single effort on our part to procure its restoration? Shall we tamely submit to the degradation of being plundered of our property, and then spend years in soliciting the plunderer to agree upon some mode in which the legality of his conduct may be tried? I trust not. It will not be in accordance with that spirit which has hitherto distinguished the American character. It would argue a weakness and pusillanimity disgraceful to us in the last degree, and cannot, I am confident, find advocates upon this floor.

What, then, shall be done? Shall we go to war? I answer, no; unless the surveying and marking our line, and resisting all forcible attempts to take our property from us, be war. I profess to be the friend of peace, and would not rashly and unnecessarily embroil our country in difficulties which would result in war; but, in this case, I have not the remotest suspicion that the measure proposed could have so disastrous and unhappy a result. Let this step be taken, and the whole question is settled. Great Britain, when she sees a determination on the part of the General Government, to have this question settled, and to cause Maine to be restored to her possessions, will agree upon terms at once. When delay shall become dangerous to her interests, depend upon it she will delay no longer. A rupture of the peaceful relations subsisting between that country and this would be one of the last things that Great Britain could regard as desirable. Nor will she permit it, when it is so easily avoided.

The President, in his last annual message, holds the following language upon this subject:

"Of pending questions, the most important is that which exists with the Government of Great Britain, in respect to our northeastern boundary. It is with unfeigned regret that the

people of
efforts made
a century,
remain in
from those
the border
tory, was f
nsible to
Government
and has br
interests of
tion shoul
full confid
Governme
adjustment
peace in 1
and a per
part, that
sibility of
tion contin
nion, which
gave the
States to t
substituti
interested
don no an
British G
subject, a
delayed.
United St
satisfied c
tain them
also, I am
England t
to say to
ment and
must be c
sent from
fancy tha
will, I tru
your last
between
and that
a subject
the Union

In thi