

(Mr. GENTRY.) Who, then, knows what is the present state of the negotiation? Who can inform us whether it is likely to prove successful or abortive? Who can tell whether it be such as to require or forbid the notice? Who can answer these questions so well, at least, as the President? None, sir; and, therefore, as this is a measure so directly connected with the treaty-making power, and as no one can judge so well *when* is the proper time to give the notice as he who knows all the facts connected with the subject, I would leave the President to give it whenever he thinks the interests of the country require it to be given. I do not look upon this course, sir, as giving power to the President. I do not favor the one-man power any more than does my colleague on the other side of the House, (Mr. THURMAN.) I desire to see the power and the patronage, too, of the President diminished, rather than increased.

But the question is this: Shall we make it imperative on the Executive to give this notice, ignorant as we are of the present posture of the negotiation; or shall we say; you may give this notice whenever you think it is advisable to do so? In either case, we confer on him the *power* to give the notice. In one event, we make it necessary for him to give it, be our condition what it may; in the other, we do not require him to do the act unless the honor of the country demands it.

It seems to me, sir, that the President should stand in this last attitude. He has brought this question before the country; he has given to the world, in an official form, his opinion in regard to the title; the negotiation is now in his hands; he has asked Congress for this power; he knows, better than we can know, the prospect of a friendly or angry termination of the present negotiation; he can, if he chooses, in defiance of us, provoke hostilities between the two countries in regard to this question. I am, therefore, for permitting the responsibility to remain where it now is—where I think it ought to be. I will leave the President unrestrained, and free to act for our best interests; and then, before God and the country, I will hold him responsible for his conduct.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot consent to close these observations without referring to a remark which I have heard during this debate, and which gave me surprise, regret, and astonishment. It has been said, sir, that the North go for this notice, and are in favor of Oregon upon sectional grounds, and with sectional feelings; that we wish to extend our population, territory, and power; and, therefore, that we make this our question. It is my purpose and design to deny and repel this charge made against the North of being sectional, and feeling hostile to the interests and institutions of the South. There is no desire in the North to disturb *the rights* which have been granted, or which belong, to any portion of this Union.

The North is a law-loving, law-abiding community. The people of the North desire to see the laws everywhere faithfully executed, and the rights of every part of the Union fully maintained. Governing themselves by this rule, they draw no line of partition from east to west, or from north to south; they have no sectional patriotism; they know but one country in which they are interested, and that, the Union. By this, sir, they understand the entire Union, and all its parts, including every segment in this great and glorious circle of our Confederacy. I deny the charge, then, that the North is sectional. I cast it back, for it is unjust, as against my constituents. But, sir, shall we be accused of local, sectional feelings, in the North?