

has been drawn out much longer than we intended. We have not sought to disprove the American title to Oregon, but only to show that it is necessarily qualified, indeterminate, and this has been proved so conclusively, that any statesman who shall hereafter declare that this title is perfect and unquestionable will afford good reason to doubt either his soundness of mind or his honesty. That the United States have rights in Oregon, equal in every respect to the British rights, is known by the full and explicit admission of England herself: and thus we have all the needed ground for a compromise, and an equitable division of the territory. Messrs. Huskinson and Addington, in their official statement, made in 1827, which we have already quoted, hold the following language:—

"The rights of Great Britain are recorded and defined in the convention of 1790; they embrace the right to navigate the waters of these countries, to settle in and over any part of them, and to trade with the inhabitants and occupiers of the same. These rights have been peaceably exercised ever since the date of that convention; that is, for a period of nearly forty years. Under that convention, valuable British interests have grown up in those countries. *It is admitted that the United States possess the same rights*, although they have been exercised by them only in a single instance, and have not, since the year 1813, been exercised at all; but beyond these rights they possess none."

Great Britain, as we have said, now offers to exchange her partial title to the whole for an exclusive title to a part, and only the terms of the division remain to be adjusted. The olive-branch is held out; it remains to be seen whether we will reject it and prefer war. To one who has not studied with some attention the records of our race, so as to be aware into what acts of folly and wickedness a country may be plunged by the ambitious and self-seeking spirit of its politicians, acting on the inflammable passions of a mob, it may seem utterly unworthy of belief, that two great nations should go to war with each other about such worthless possessions.—*Nor. Am. Rev.*

The Oregon question, which carries with it the chances of peace or war, is still the theme which fills every mind and occupies every tongue. The debates in Congress acquire a new interest daily, and the subject seems to become more complex. The lull which took place last week, in consequence of the pacific course of Mr. Calhoun, has been disturbed by the warlike speeches of Mr. Adams, and others.

On the 5th Mr. Ingersoll, in the House of Representatives, from the Committee of Foreign Relations, brought forward the long expected resolution, for giving the year's notice to Great Britain to terminate the treaty of joint occupancy. It was to the following effect:—

"Resolved, (the Senate concurring,) That the President of the United States forthwith cause notice to be given to the Government of Great Britain, that the convention between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the territory of Oregon, of the 6th of August, 1827, signed at London, shall be annulled and abrogated twelve months after the expiration of the said term of notice, conformably to the 2d article of the said convention of the 6th of August, 1827."

It appears that, in the Committee from which this resolution emanated, there was a difference of opinion as to the propriety of its adoption; and, in consequence, Mr. Gilbert Davis, one of the dissentients, appeared with a counter resolution, which he was authorized to make on behalf of the minority. This counter resolution was to the following purport:—

"Resolved, That the question whether a notice to terminate the convention between the United States of America and Great Britain, of October, 1818, and continued in force by the convention of August, 1827, ought to be given, is not a matter for the decision of Congress, and upon it this House at present refrains from the expression of any opinion."

Mr. Ingersoll then moved, which he was directed to do by the Committee of Foreign Relations, that the resolution be taken up for consideration on the first Monday in February next. On this motion a very interesting debate arose and continued throughout the day, when an adjournment took place. In the course of this

day's debate a very remarkable speech was made by Mr. Geddings, of Ohio, in which he announced his change of opinion. On a former occasion, he said, he had been opposed to giving the notice to Great Britain, but since then, the Union had been changed in its essential elements, [by the admission of Texas] and a slave-holding oligarchy now holds the entire direction of the government. The southern portion of the Union, he averred, now hold the balance of power in the United States. Under these circumstances, he continued:—

"I am led to the conclusion, to the irresistible conclusion, that war, with all its horrors and its devastation of public morals, is infinitely preferable to a supine inactive submission to the slave-holding power, that is to control this nation if left in its present situation. I wish to be distinctly understood that I have seen enough of war to form an opinion of its effects, its miseries, and the extent of its curse. Yet sir, *I greatly prefer them*, for a few years, to the quiet apathy which has already subjected us to a change of the Government formed by our fathers."

"Let no one say that I desire a slave insurrection; but, sir, I doubt not that hundreds of thousands of honest and patriotic hearts will 'laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh.' No, sir; should a servile insurrection take place—should massacre and blood mark the footsteps of those who have for ages been oppressed, my prayer to God shall be that *justice—stern, unyielding and unalterable justice, may be awarded to the master and to the slave.*"

Other parts of his speech were even more emphatic and startling. Mr. Geddings is one of the party called Abolitionists, who sees in the admission of Texas into the Union, an additional permanency given to the slave system of this country; and he considers this so great an evil that he prefers war to the continuance of peace—as war would break up this slave system or neutralize it, either by a slave insurrection promoted by British invasion, or by the conquest and annexation to the Northern portion of the Union of some of the British Provinces. Such is the purport of his speech as we understand it. In addition to this, it is affirmed by a portion of the press, that the moving cause of Mr. Adams's warlike oration was this same Abolition sentiment, and that he and Mr. Geddings acted with a perfect understanding of each others views. We know not how far this may be true, but if the supposition be well founded, it follows that the war party has received an accession of strength by the adhesion of the Anti-Slavery portion of the country. Under such circumstances it is difficult to say how matters will terminate.

But the peace party is not idle. Mr. Winthrop of Boston, Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, Mr. Yancy, of Alabama—have made powerful speeches in favour of moderation, and the resumption of friendly negotiations. The speeches are long, and we regret that we can only give skeletons of them. That the members of the Southern part of the confederacy are ranging themselves under the banner of Mr. Calhoun, is sufficiently apparent; and that Mr. Calhoun is the advocate of peace, is certain. But the strength of the parties has not yet been tested by any decisive vote, and we therefore can give no opinion as to results.

Among many extraordinary things said in Congress, Mr. Owen stated that when American settlers went over to Oregon, and settled north of the Columbia, they were immediately bought off by the Hudson's Bay Company. One poor man, he averred, was cruelly bought off with \$800!! If this could be proved, how many would flock thither to endure the like persecution!

The line of 49 degrees without some modification as to harbours, is inadmissible to Great Britain. All the country north of it, as we have said, is without value; it yields nothing, is poor, rocky, and cheerless; it affords no access to the interior, nor can the Hudson's Bay Company reach the hunting grounds through it. Frazer's river is not navigable, and the country possesses no other stream of any magnitude. This same line cuts off the southern extremity of Vancouver's Island, which would give to the United States both sides, and of course the command of the Straits of Fuca; while the channel between Vancouver's Island and the main