

protection of our laws; give them aid and security in their toilsome march, and soon the wild spirit of western adventure will crowd your mountain-passes with hardy emigrants. Then, sir, the American settler, as he wends his way to the Rocky mountains, and takes up his abode in that far-off country, will find going with him the protection of American laws; that protection will be with him in his journeyings by the way; in his slumbers in the dark defiles of the Rocky mountains; will be with and around him when in the valleys of Oregon he pitches his tent and builds his cabin, to remain there an American citizen, near the shores of the great Pacific. Let us encourage emigration; let our people go armed with the physical means of self-defence; send them with the unerring western rifle; with hearts true to themselves and their country, and Oregon will be ours.

It has been said, sir, that England, with her voracious appetite for dominion, never relinquishes her grasp upon territory when once within her power; that, in her negotiations, she seldom recedes from the positions she assumes. I will not deny the skill and success of British diplomacy. She varies it to suit the character of the nation with which she negotiates. She tramples upon the weak, flatters the timid, and betrays the strong. Yet, notwithstanding her power as a nation, and her skill in diplomacy, the lion of England, like the king of the forest, will quail and cower before the unflinching gaze of stern and determined resistance. With the memorable example before us of the thirteen American colonies wrested from the British Crown, and their independence acknowledged by that Power, it is too late to say that England never yields. Did time permit, I could refer gentlemen to the history of the treaty of peace at Ghent to prove that even England can recede from positions declared by her commissioners to be

"*sine qua non*" in the adjustment of existing controversies. In the progress of that negotiation, she demanded, as a "*sine qua non*," the pacification of the Indian tribes, and in effect their recognition by the United States as independent nations within our territory. A proposition so presumptuous, it is needless to add, was instantly rejected by the American commissioners. She further demanded that the United States should abandon her naval power upon the lakes, and dismantle her fortifications upon their shores and along the line of our northern frontier. Like the other, it was promptly rejected, and England very prudently receded from her bold "*sine qua non*" propositions. In the conduct of negotiations and of this controversy, we must look England firmly in the face. To doubt, to hesitate, to betray symptoms of fear, is to lose all.

Sir, there will be no war. The mutual interests of both countries forbid it. The commercial relations of the two nations obviously require peace, and no reason now exists or can arise from our present action why these relations should be disturbed. Gentlemen have pointed us to England, to her extensive warlike preparations, her steamers of war, and the fortification of her coast, and have asked, what means all this preparation at this crisis? England, notwithstanding her extensive warlike preparations—although she may be manning her fleets and floating on the ocean her war-steamer by hundreds—will not enter into a con-

test with us. All this is not intended for the American nation. Another question is soon to be solved in Europe; there is another struggle soon to come, that will require all her force. "All Europe is now awaiting in intense anxiety the happening of an event that will be pregnant with the fate of empires. I refer, sir, to the death of Louis Philippe of France. His death (and I am not alone in this opinion) will be the signal for a great struggle throughout the whole of Europe. Then, sir, will come that conflict of systems of government to which gentlemen have so frequently alluded—a war of republicanism against despotism, of popular rights against oppression and tyranny. This is the contingency which the English dread more than they do the Oregon question, and this is the reason for her immense preparations. But if gentlemen suppose she is doing all this in reference to a contest with us, are we pursuing a prudent course? If Britain is putting on her armor to fight with us, it would be surely wise in us to follow her example. If gentlemen really believe that she has such a purpose, let them remember that when England strikes she strikes swiftly, and always strikes the first blow, and often with tremendous effect. Sir, in our present relations with England, I feel inclined to adopt the sentiment of the old Irish baronet, whose very blunders were full of practical good sense and sound philosophy, "that the best way to avoid danger is to meet it plump." Sir, let us be prepared for any contingency—always ready, always willing to defend our country and maintain her honor.

Again, sir, as a proof that there will be no war, and that such an event is not anticipated by those who hold the reins of Government, I refer gentlemen to the fact that, although the Administration has told us that negotiations are ended, yet no preparations are recommended or appropriations asked for the navy or for the army; that no steps have been taken to place the country in a state of defence. But, instead of all this, the Secretary of the Treasury sits down deliberately in his office and computes that, after a certain number of years, there will be a certain sum of money in the Treasury, and at the same time recommends that the tariff of 1842 be repealed, and that duties be reduced to the revenue standard; thus bestowing upon England the greatest favor she could ask from the American Government. Such facts are utterly inconsistent with the idea of war.

But, sir, what is to be gained by war? Can we conquer England? Can she subdue us? The idea is preposterous. Neither nation can enter into such a contest without immense sacrifices. We may expend millions of treasure and shed oceans of blood, and yet our controversy with England be no more near its termination than when the first gun was fired.

We have been told during this debate that we must not look at consequences. No; but, like the "unthinking horse, must rush into the battle." I can adopt no such principle of action on this question. It is our duty to sit down like wise men and count the cost; to consider well what we are about, and what we are going to do; to consider our adversary in her strength, her means of attack, and her ability to injure; to consider our own power, our means of defence, our ability to resist aggression. This is wisdom; and, having thus acted, if

war me
to be w

It ha
this qu
be dish
cur. T
closed,
abundo
and 182
A simil
tration
ble now
riods to
edly, by
wise, re
and adj
an equit
we now
tion, if
proposit
have of
with hor
rejected
offer.

Sir, it
given, b
negotiati
mode of
two nati
for every
will rush
which no

I regre
of this di
war. W
for me.
of warric
rolled in
a scene.
wring fr
the battle
rendered
and frien
heard th
brace the
idol of h
prived of
wish to l
of victory
fall disco
circle the
stained w
thousand
Christian
Eternal, t
be avert
withstand
to be four
national
hazard ar
must be r
the strict
hausted e
an amica