with the manufactures of England in other regions of the globe. The tariff page the message is more than a salvo to the Oregon part. Whilst the Oregon part of message makes John Bull frown, the free trade part of it drives that frown from and c brow; and he delightedly exults in contemplating the commercial and manufacturan prosperity which will enure to him, when, by the policy of the President, the mer the facturing interests of this country shall be broken down, and the country therebondition stored to a commercial dependance on England, like that which existed when these the States were her colonies. The British Government, then, will make no war with United States about Oregon, whilst our Government offers her, as an equivalent Bucha her claims in that territory, commercial advantages far more valuable to her than, den undisputed possession of the whole of Oregon. Give England satisfactory assure titude that the policy recommended by the President will be the permanent policy of this wyer, tion, and she will, to secure such a result, give us the whole of Oregon; and I am y arg sure that she would not cede us the Canadas also. For what purpose does she may to the tain her colonial system, at a vast expense, other than to promote her commercial horr manufacturing interests. Guaranty to her these interests, and she would gladly recommended to the expense of governing and defending these colonies. herself of the expense of governing and defending those colonies. Has our minist that th London been instructed to urge these considerations upon the British Government that h dispose that Government to liberal concessions with respect to the Oregon controver in co Has he been instructed to negotiate a commercial treaty with that Government he hi would like to know. I desire to see those instructions. There will be no warmen who about Oregon, unless, by some act of extreme folly, this Government shall place conclu question in such an attitude that England cannot make the concessions demandery on our Government, without sacrificing her honor, without losing her high position and Had

Gentlemen affect extreme sensitiveness about the honor of the country, as involving exp this controversy with England. They assume that "our title to the whole of Orn made is clear and unquestionable," and declare that any adjustment of our controversy eled her England, which shall give to her any portion of that territory, will be a dishonol of a n purchase of peace. Can they see no dishonor in adapting the legislation of their was esta try, on questions affecting the interests of our own people and country, to the purpose and interests of England? Are they willing to purchase peace, in a controversy ty by S comparatively valueless territory, by sacrificing, as a peace offering, that wise system that s of policy which was founded by the fathers of this republic—by surrendering that ocean, l icy which has made our country grow, and prosper, and flourish, as no nation event upon

fore grew, and prospered, and flourished?

But, Mr. Chairman, the clock admonishes me that the hour to which I am limited that a rule of the House is rapidly passing away, and that I must hasten to some other all for siderations which I desire briefly to present to this committee. Is the title of the Up th of States to the whole of the Oregon territory, or any part of it, a perfect title—a "briefle to and unquestionable" title? I am not a lawyer, and am not competent, therefore, into those pine distinctions and technicalities that a refer to some technicalities that are referred to this committee. Is the title of the Up th of States to the whole of the Oregon technicalities to the whole of the Up th of States to the whole of the Up th of States to the whole of the Up th of States to the whole of the Oregon technicalities to the whole of the Up th of States to the whole of the Oregon technicalities to the oregon technicalities to the oregon technicalities that the oregon technicalities the oregon technicali which have been very properly introduced in this debate by gentlemen learned in this debate by gentlemen learned in the determine the destruction is law, to determine the doubtful questions of fact and of law involved in that title. territory only law with which I am familiar (and I am not sure that I am even master of the law of the law of common sense. I have looked into the facts of the case, I have listen Gove the arguments, and, as far as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of a state of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of the case, I have listen as I have been able, have made myself acquainted with the case of th principles of public law applicable to the controversy; and it appears to me, that which it ery point of the controversy there is a plausible conflict between the claims of En and the United States; and if all the facts which either nation contends for, as the grand of their respective claims, be admitted as true, yet, when you apply the admitted ciples of public law to the claim of either nation, no principle of that law can be not apply the admitted ciples of public law to the claim of either nation, no principle of that law can be not apply the admitted ciples of public law to the claim of either nation, no principle of that law can be not apply the admitted ciples of public law to the claim of either nation, no principle of that law can be not apply the admitted ciples of public law to the claim of either nation. 

No