"It is true, a treaty is the law of the land. But, then, as the whole business of revenue and general provision for all the wants of the country is undoubtedly a very peculiar business of the House of Representatives, or of Congress. I am of opinion, and always have been, that there should be no encroachment upon that power by the exercise of the treaty-making power, unless in case of great and evident necessity."

There have been some cases of necessity like that of France in the case of Louisiana. And yet he says that in the speech in which Oregon was not mentioned at all, in which I repudiated altogether the levying of revenue by the treaty-making power, that I recommended a treaty with England. Sir, I grow weary, weary with this speech. Who should shield to representations and imputations apparently so groundless? Why, sir, there is one thing in the speech from which I will supplicate its author to have me excused. He says he urged treaty with me in politics. That is true. We never did, I think we never shall agree. He said, many years ago, that if he had lived in the time of the Revolution, he would have been a "Tory." I don't think I would. He has said, also, very recently in a printed book of his, that the Declaration of Independence was entered by Hancock, if not by accident. That is his estimate of the great charter of our national existence. We would never agree in politics, I admit. But, he said, Mr. Webster is a man of talents. Here I beg to be excused. I can bear his abuse, but if he undertakes my commendation, I begin to tremble for my reputation. I ask again, what can account for the apparent inconsistency of his statements? I do think that they are made through malice. I am inclined to think there is not feeling enough in him of like or dislike. I think I perceive from a moral obtuseness—a native want of perception between truth and falsehood, or the want of so long a disciplined in that sublime school of morals that teaches all is fair in politics and if ever he possessed an iota of original discrimination, it is altogether obliterated. But what does he say further? Speaking of the treaty of Washington, he said that he "rejoiced" that the "Lion of New York." His notion of "Lion" is to state all the facts in your case, and then, if you will the rest. "That was a great triumph." I will not say that it was a great triumph. I will say what I wish pro and con. I will say what I think ought to be the attention of the Senate. I will say what I think ought to be the attention of the Senate. I will say what I think ought to be the attention of the Senate