e to which class of t necessary for me to

strengthen the bonda? or establish and carry on commerce ? But strengthen the hondar or establish and carry on commerce i but e in future a perfect ary specify these minor rights, if, by "settle-unding between the ter," Spain intended to give an interest in the greed that their rest? An unrestricted right of settlement, the disturbed or mole it as construed and understood by my col-rrying on their fisher as construed and understood by my col-n the South seas, or al rights. If Spain intended by the right purpose of carrying ettlement to convey the right of soil, it was natives of the councily unnecessary to specify the additional. pri-there—the whole loges which were granted: for the right of restrictions specificatlement, carrying with it the right of soil, enrestrictions specificittlement, carrying with it the right of soil, encs."

tled the settler to navigate, fish, and land on one point of diffice coast, and trade with the natives, without vill doubtless all an, express grant for that purpose. 'Then why, ting, fishing, and here they juserted? Fishing and carrying on purpose of carrying manerce with the natives of that country were es of the country matable employments. England knew that; falling within that can in order to secure them to her subjects, she

falling within that chief in order to secure them to her subjects, she ogated and annulled only specified them in the third article of her and Spain. But only, specified them in the third article of her anding on the coast go, which were necessary to enable her sub-ettlements, about which to enjoy and use profitably the privileges And my purpose i ired. They wanted to establish trading points ight of settlement, ere the natives could find them that they a character ident the carry on commerce—where they could b it in the same artistic, cure, and prepare their fish for market.— as read, British at lengent was necessary for that purpose. Tak-of navigation, fisher these views of the treaty of 1790 between heredy occupied, for reat Britain and Spain—construing the term bit commerce with ettement used in it as I do—distinguishing beeir commerce with settlement used in it as I do-distinguishing bettlements there, proven the extent of its meaning there, and the of settlement carmenning we ordinarily give to it-I am led to ; and that, there the conclusion that it was intended as a mere a right even to pincident to the right of fishing and trading ; and as such was abrogated with the rest of the privi-se who hold that loges granted in that article by the war of 1796 entire grants of between Spain and Great Britain. to the one grand. Mr. Chairman, peace is desirable, and should Britain Britain.

It Britain had in voo preserved if it can be done in an honorable correging on commentary. But I tell gentlemen now, and hope they nuntry. She did will look to it, if they suffer the present Confor any other purperses to adjourn without action on this question ere. And if you they will regret it. The people have been hatransaction, you presed long enough with it; they demand its set-hich led to, and w tlement, and will be disappointed and much disand convention, or satisfied if we adjourn without doing all we can rt on the part of I towards it. If this controversy should remain ne very privileges open and unadjusted, so as to constitute the prin-y that treaty. The pal element (as it will do) in our next popular nd trade; but to et elections, there will be no half-way house left, they must also h The next Congress will be forced on by public w could they fishs opinion arising from a feverish state of the pubto uavigate the , lie mind caused by our failure or refusal to act at tself says, "navig this Congress. heries in the Pac The President of the United States has taken

nd on the coast i high ground upon this subject. His message has spensable to fishi been endorsed and eulogized throughout the s. For if they we length and breadth of this Union. The people could they carry have responded to his positions in tones of the ? And if they highest approval, and it now becomes our duty right to crect te to act. Shall we do so? Must we stand still, recede, or go forward? These questions are

rary houses or huts, how could they cure their the crisis; and, in so doing, act with manly If we recede, or fail to move onward, firmness. we leave the administration in its high and patriotic position "solitary and alone."

The President of the United States has taken a bold but judicious and wise step; he has gone beyond any previous administration; and if we refuse to sustain him, we not only destroy the influence of his administration at home and abroad, but we effectually block up the avenue to a settlement of our Oregon controversy. England will view it as a rebuke of the President by the people-that they condem his recommendations in regard to Oregon. She will then rest ut ease and cease her efforts to adjust it by negotiation. As matters now stand under the treaty she has all she wants, and if we refuse to give the notice, the question will not be settled. If, however, we present a bold and undivided front, give the notice, and show that a settlement is determined upon, and that it must come, then, sir, in my opinion, you will bring about an adjustment.

Indo not present these views in a party sense. I speak not as a partisan, but as an Americanand I hope to be so understood. Barty feelings may arise among, and divide us upon questions of domestic policy; but on a question between the United States and a foreign nation, shere should be but one party in this countrythe American party.

I do not mean that our duty calls upon us to sustain the President in his position, merely because he is the President, irrespective of right. If he had taken wrong ground, it would be our highest duty to check and restrain him. We should throw ourselves into the breach, and pro tect the country and its honor. Under all of the circumstances, however, as they exist, I consider that to give the notice will be the best for the country; and believing so, whether the President were a whig or a democrat, I would promptly rally to his support. In a crisis like this, it will not do for us to *faller* or *turn pale*.... If we begin with improper or unnecessary hesitation-if we stop to plead our own weakness, and the strength of our adversary-if we exhibit timidity or a want of firmness, war will come upon us. If, therefore, we would avoid war, we must not evince too great an anxiety to do so.

I am not prepared to say to my constituents that we will have no war. They have all of the information which is in my possession, and are as competent to determine that as I am. I have given them my opinion, which remains unchanged.

Sir, gentlemen tell us that we are weak and defenceless as a nation; that we are unprepared for war; that our navy is hardly a nest-egg, our army a mere skeleton; that we lack guns and ammunition, fortifications and harbors. Indeed, if we but listen to speeches of the oppostion recede, or go forward? These questions are on this question, we would suppose we had no-presented to us and to the country. Let us meet thing to fight with. They mistake-they under-