

article in the "organ" of the Administration of the 27th ult., now before me, in which it is said: "We have before spoken of the *new shape* which the Oregon question has assumed," &c. ? And again: "We then alluded to this *newness* of aspect, in the question, by way of suggestion as to the *new national duty* which, in our judgment, its present position imposes on us."

The same article, after alluding to a proposal contained in the London Times, in regard to Oregon, proceeds to implore the British Government to modify this proposal, so as to make it more acceptable, and then submit it to this country, and adds: "It would not then be unreasonable to hope, that on such a proposal, *so made and so carried out to the more ample recognition of our just claims, farther negotiation might yet build a peaceful monument to the enlightened moderation and justice of two great nations.*" I think the whole of this is intelligible, and not difficult to be understood; particularly when it is remembered that it has been said in a leading English journal, that "neither to England nor to the United States is Oregon worth six months' *unrestricted traffic between them.*" The "new shape" of this question, then, is its connection with the tariff. Our "new national duty" is to abolish this tariff, and give England "*free trade.*" Then, if she will make us another proposition "to the more ample recognition of our just claims" in Oregon, "farther negotiation will build up a peaceful monument" between the two countries.

Are the people prepared for this sacrifice? Is it supposed that the West is so blind to its true interest, that it will be satisfied with such bargain as this? Does the Administration feel authorized thus to traffic with the labor, the industry, the business, the welfare, and prosperity of the country? If it does, allow me, sir, to predict that there is a day coming, and it is not distant, of fearful retribution to the plotters and conductors of this political iniquity.

In regard to the form, in which this notice shall be given, I desire, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words. I prefer, very decidedly, the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama, (Mr. HILLIARD.) This proposition, if I understand it, authorizes the President to give the notice whenever, in his opinion, the honor and welfare of the country require it. This notice, if not strictly part of the treaty-making power, is nearly allied to it. It is, at least, most directly and intimately connected with it. Many of our best constitutional lawyers consider it as belonging to the treaty-making power. They therefore oppose the notice on the ground that it is not necessary; that the President now has the power to give it provided he sees fit to do so. Whether this be true or not, sir, it seems to me that there is such intimacy of relation between this notice and the treaty-making power, that they ought not to be separated; and that the President should be authorized to give the notice, and then be left to his discretion as to the *time and manner of giving it.* It is not difficult to imagine a state of things that might render the giving of this notice unnecessary, if not improper, arising *after* the passage of the resolution here, or if existing *before*, being entirely unknown to this House when the resolution was passed. We do not know what may be the present state and condition of the negotiation. We did not know, except by rumor, that negotiations had been resumed, until that fact was announced on this floor to-day, by the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, (Mr. INGERSOLL,) in answer to the enquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee,

(Mr. Ge  
ation?  
abortive  
tice? W  
None, si  
the treat  
proper ti  
the subje  
interests  
course, s  
power an  
(Mr. Tr  
President

But th  
to give t  
tion; or  
visible t  
notice.  
dition w  
less the

It see  
He has  
in an off  
in his h  
we can  
negotiat  
between  
permitti  
ought to  
our best  
respons

Mr. C  
ferring  
me surp  
go for t  
with se  
and po  
pose an  
being a  
South.  
been g

The  
North  
of ever  
rule, t  
south;  
which  
the en  
and gl  
North  
ents.