

individual praise, to disparage the trade, said yesterday that men have grown rich in it. Now I apprehend that, comparing great things with small, his mark is equally true of manufactures. In these, a disproportion between the few capitalists get rich, and the multitudes of poor operatives never can? It is but the same thing in either suit: the operatives amass not the splendid fortunes, nor does every hunter and trapper become rich as Jacob Astor. Chance or taste leads them to adopt that pursuit; and it forms one of those national interests which we are bound to protect, in common with even the humblest branch of your industry or commerce. Whenever your sails catch the sea, in no matter what clime, against no other whom, the national arm stretches out its protection. Everywhere but in this unhappy territory, the persons and the pursuits of your citizens are watched over. You count no cost when other interests are concerned, when other rights are asserted; but you recoil here from a trifling appropriation to an object of the highest national importance, because it enlists no sectional influence. Contrast, for instance, your supineness about the Oregon Territory with your alacrity to establish, guarding the slave coast and Liberia, a squadron costing \$600,000 annually, and which you have and yourself by treaty to keep up for five years, in great exposure of lives and vessels. By stipulation, eighty guns (one-twelfth of your force) is kept upon this service; and, as your national expenditure amounts to about seven millions a year, this (its twelfth part) will make, in five years, three millions bestowed in watching the coast of Africa, and guarding the freedom of the globe! For this you lavish millions; and you grudge \$100,000 to the great American and national object of asserting your territorial rights and settling your soil. You grant at once what furthers a slave policy of a rival power, and deny the means of rescuing from its grasp your own property and soil!

[Here Mr. L. referred again to the letter of Mr. Baldwin, which we have given at large.*]

To show the operations of the Hudson Bay Company, in our American fur traders, public attention is called to the following extract of Mr. Townsend's excellent remarks upon the Territory of Oregon, recently published in the National Intelligencer.

Within a few years, several Americans (of whom the writer this notice is one) have crossed the Rocky Mountains to the mouth of the Columbia, with object entirely unconnected with trade or commerce. Mine was the desire to see a new country, and to adventure for its own sake, and an enthusiastic fondness for natural history.

The party with which I travelled left Independence, Missouri, about the latter part of April, 1834, and arrived at the mouth of the Columbia in September, having performed the whole journey on horseback. From this time until October, 35, (with the exception of the first winter, which I passed at a Sandwich Island,) my residence was in the Territory of Oregon. Dr. McLaughlin, the chief factor, treated me with dignity and singular kindness, supplying all my wants, and facilitating me with every facility in the prosecution of my aims. This, I believe, the uniform character of the superintendents of British forts in that country. Travellers, naturalists, and all who are not traders, are kindly and most hospitably treated; but the moment the visitor is known to trade a heavy skin from an Indian, that moment he is ejected from the community, and all communication between him and the officers of the company ceases. When Captain Wyeth, with his party, arrived at Walla-Walla fort, on his passage down the Columbia, he was required by the superintendent to promise that during his journey from thence to Vancouver—300 miles he would not buy a beaver skin; the functionary assuring him that, unless he consented so to bind himself, he would send a party ahead of him which should be instructed to purchase every beaver skin from the Indians on the route, at a price which he (Wyeth) could not afford to pay. It is a fact, notori-

The general objection to the bill has been confined to the grants of land. The South Carolina Senators alone have viewed the establishment of military posts as a violation of the convention. And I understood one of those Senators to assert even that, under the treaty, we could not extend over the territory our legal jurisdiction, as Britain has done.

[Mr. McDuffie here assured Mr. L. that he had misapprehended him: he held that we could extend our jurisdiction over the Indians and our own citizens.]

Mr. LINN. Well, sir, I stand corrected. I now hold in my hand a copy of the contract which the Hudson Bay Company passes with its employees, by which it is agreed that when the employee has served a certain number of years, and wishes to retire, he shall have a grant of fifty acres of land, a suit of the company's clothes, &c., he binding himself to a sort of feudal tenure to muster and bear arms when needed.

Now, sir, does not this contract incontestably establish, on their part, everything which it is denied that we can do? Is it to be supposed that the company does not keep these engagements? That cannot be; and we know that their retired servants have for some time had settlements and occupied lands, in conformity with these agreements. I ask Senators, then, are we always to argue against ourselves—always to interpret our national duties in favor of other nations, and to our own detriment? Was it not thus in 1823, when gentlemen contended that we could not establish military posts in the territory, nor extend our jurisdiction over it? This, too, when Great Britain had already taken those steps over the whole northwest, and even over a part of our territory on this side the Rocky Mountains.

But gentlemen surely mistake when they imagine that this British jurisdiction can be confined to British subjects alone. Pray, sir, were an American to commit murder on an employee of the company, does anybody believe that he would not be tried and hanged under this British law? The English ministry, I know, has said (as Mr. Gallatin tells us) that it was not intended to be applied to any but British subjects and Indians. But what then? What will the opinion of this or that minister signify, a case having actually occurred? By settled law, any denizen coming within its jurisdiction, and committing a crime, will be punished; and if there is a British judge or justice of the peace there, he will be bound to execute this law, to its letter, against Americans as all others.

My friend from Vermont [Mr. PHILIPS] made it clear that, under this law, controversies likewise as to land titles between citizens of the two countries would pass under this jurisdiction. If so, why not as much criminal offences? But as to such scrupulous limiting of their legal assumptions, they are far more likely to enlarge them. I never heard of an Indian being hung under that law; but I have lately learned the occurrence of a case

in that country, that the honorable company has a sum of money, amounting to several thousand pounds sterling, laid aside at Vancouver, for the sole purpose of opposing all who may come to interfere with its monopoly, by purchasing at exorbitant prices all the furs in possession of the Indians, and thus forcing the settler to come to terms, or driving him from the country. If it be an individual who is thus starved into submission, he then usually clears a piece of land on the Wallamet river, takes an Indian wife, and purchases furs of the natives, which, by previous contract, he is bound to sell to the company at an advance which is fixed by the Governor."