

ve annul this
rd to cut this
ards of nego-
o that which
circumstances,
which Mr.
under far
d, under far
States were
rmous debts
bequeathed
tagonist was
will be con-
Great Britain
ting her foot
enus of war,
ed in all the
var as she is
l having pre-
r movements
e not a friend
ase—she has
uiting on a
an enormous
world, in the
ng the coasts
too, she has
dy immense

who so elo-
lay upon this
to count the
r ships, or to
a feeling of
gushing im-
curred in the
however, be
this instance,
om to obtain
ne strength of
led not only
in order to
I cannot but
is high-toned
ver the whole
that this is vic-
now that it is
ght—if truth
cks of war—
now commit
ir, that is not
les upon the
ng this, it be-
the means of
s, but to see
own into that
sts and weap-
maintain their
passionately
an opposing
praise than
that, shutting
upon the ob-
nd armed ma-

prepared for
peace" we have
e very West
try in its vi-
ough-continued
uch increase
the wants of

the country, it seems to me, imperiously demand. Many of our ships are rotting on the stocks, or lying idly in harbor; and our officers, of course, permitted to roam over the land, instead of the sea. Our army is so small that even at this moment, as I learn from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, there is not a single United States soldier in the State of Alabama—none to light a match, if a hostile force enters the waters of Mobile bay.

At this very time, too, when war's dread horrors are laughed at by young members of this House—full of courage, doubtless, but with no experience—even now, when we are about to dare old England to cross swords with us, serious opposition is made to passing the bill of your Military Committee, providing for the raising of a single regiment of rifle-men!

Entirely unprepared, then, for such a terrible conflict as that between ourselves and Great Britain must inevitably be, will it be deemed treasonable, dishonorable, or cowardly, in one who here represents a portion of the people who are to be affected by it, to advise that "discretion, that better part of val'r," warns us to avoid it, if it can be done with honor?

But I am here met with the assertion that this notice is a *peace measure*. Would that I could believe so. But I cannot shut my eyes to the contrary, written as with a pen of iron, both on the notice itself, and on the facts attending it. As yet I have listened in vain to some half-a-dozen hour speeches in its favor, for a single argument showing it to be such. On the contrary, nearly every advocate of notice being given, runs into enthusiasm in contemplating the glories to be achieved in revenging the long unredressed injuries which England has committed upon the world! I will not repeat my argument showing that the convention was adopted as a *substitute for war*, and that therefore its termination involves war, or an abandonment of the claim of one or the other nation. I will now show how it is viewed by its supporters, peace advocates though they are asserted to be.

In the first place, the President, it seems to me, does not view it as a peace measure. I have had no conversation with him upon the point, and therefore speak only by that chart of his opinions officially communicated to Congress—his message. In that document he informs us that "no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected." "All attempts at compromise having failed," he recommends that "measures be taken for the maintenance of our just title to that country." Now, sir, if England will accept of no compromise that we can offer, and we are to maintain, by "measures" now to be taken, "our just title," what must those "measures" be? "Measures" of a character to force England to acknowledge "our just title," of course; and, as one of those measures, the President recommends that this notice be given; and very properly and wisely informs Congress that at the end of the year's notice, "we shall have reached a period when the national rights in Oregon must either be *abandoned or firmly maintained*." And *how*, is now a pertinent question, and against whom? The answer is easy—by armies, by fleets, by war against England, if she does not abandon a claim which she refused "all attempts" to compromise!

I say that it is written on the very face of the

aspect which this question presents, that giving this notice, and taking exclusive possession of Oregon, as the President recommends, is a war move. How are we to carry it into effect? How are we to dispossess our adversary from her thirty forts in Oregon? Certainly, those who know Great Britain will not dream that a mere reading of our law before those forts will cause their commanders to strike the cross of St. George, and quietly give us exclusive possession. Gentlemen have ransacked her history to some advantage in this debate, and have learned that for centuries she has been acquiring colonies, and urging herself up the scale of territorial accretion, till now, as has been beautifully and no less forcibly said, "the sun never sets upon her dominions."

Have they yet found a case, when, after so long and so perseveringly persisting in a claim, she at last, on the first show of opposition, quietly abandoned it? If so, I am yet to be informed of it! Then, to execute your law for asserting "our just title," force must be an ingredient of the means used.

The venerable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Adams] has so argued this question; though, at the same time, saying, in what I conceive to have been carefully selected phraseology, that he "did not believe at all in any danger of war, at this time." Whether he designed to cover, with his belief, the close of the twelve months given by the convention, he has not informed us. At all events, his arguments breathed a fierce, energetic war spirit. Truly and well did he depict the whole character of this move, when he illustrated it by reciting a celebrated event in history, exclaiming with very great emphasis—"This is the military way of doing business." His illustration was drawn from the memoirs of Frederick the Great. "I had some excellent old pretensions," wrote Frederick, "to an Austrian province, which some of my ancestors had owned one or two hundred years before, and I sent an ambassador to the court of Vienna, stating my claim, and presenting a full exposition of my right to the province. The same day that my ambassador was received in Vienna, I entered Silesia with my army." Without reflecting upon the bad faith which appears to me to have marked the proceeding of the Prussian monarch; and which seems therefore to be a strange example for so venerable a statesman to offer to our councils as an illustration of the course to be pursued, I accept it as indicative of the turn which affairs are expected to take after our ambassador gives notice. I only could sincerely desire that my own country was as well prepared to assert its title with a hundred thousand men as Frederick was—for as assuredly war follows our notice, as did the long and devastating war which the king's movement led to.

[Mr. KENNEDY, of Indiana, here remarked, "Half of that number would be sufficient."]

My friend on my left says that half of the number will answer. It is easy, sir, to talk of conquest—not so easy to effect them. My western friends here talk of war with England as a mere matter of amusement! England, they say, will fall in the contest; and we might readily suppose that they think that in a collision with us, she would "dissipate into thin air!" Do they know or reflect for a moment upon the responsibilities and dread consequences of a collision between twenty millions of people on either side, furiously seeking each other's