

ady well known in the
t. La Salle, and White's
number still greater of
ne subject lie in maou-
I been previously pub-
his estimation of the
ell as a sense of justice,
e what he had already
st published is more or
iously been published,
at sincerely hopes that
will enable him to per-
find no willing critics
ence,—will publish the
he alludes, and give to
ive collection of the me-
us and distinguished men
rity of North America.

y Robert Greenhow.
alconer's reply to my
ceed, without further
s upon it, agreeably to
examined the several

ok on the Discovery of
y answer applies, and
e Oregon question is in
d a quotation from the
overnment, by Alden
stipulation in the trea-
ce ceded Louisiana to
occupied many pages
ons and arguments to
faith and treachery of
upon the strength of this
I showed—what every
on this subject should
passage, nor any like it,
ended by saying that it
ppose that he never saw
rwise stand amenable to
ly brought forward the
ct of these remarks, as
h the object of defaming

postscript," does not seem
ver saw the treaty. He
refer "to the passage as
eaty," in his first work;
ad altered the word *treaty*
to be misunderstood; and,
in the treaty itself, it does
of the agreement on which
This is mere quibbling.
own, or believed by any
etween the United States
e extent of Louisiana, is
le of the treaty, as quoted
book; and he is fully as
der Gulliver's voyage to
agreement, as the passage
t to represent as such. "It

is thus represented," he says, "by Dr. Bradford." This is not the fact: Bradford, whose work is now before me, says nothing whatever calculated to induce that supposition; and if he had, a man professing, like Mr. Falconer, to enlighten the world on questions so momentous, should have consulted the treaty and documents relating to it himself, and not have depended on others, as others again may depend on him for its contents. Mr. Falconer ends his paragraph by declaring that "Mr. Greenhow does not say that the passage is, in any respect, inaccurate." This is a most strange assertion; for, in my answer, which must have been before him at the time, I pronounce it to be "merely a gratuitous, and certainly unfounded, opinion as to the limits of Louisiana."

2. On the rights of nations to occupy vacant territories, I cannot here enter into an argument. Many pages of my History of Oregon are devoted to this subject—parts of which are copied by Mr. Falconer in his book, with judicious alterations; and other parts are omitted, to suit his convenience. I leave him to reconcile as he can the opinions expressed in the first sentence of this paragraph, (No. 2,) on the subject of "taking possession," with those on the same subject, in the last sentence but one of the same paragraph. His concluding assertion, that "such (or any other) possession of Oregon, accompanied by occupation, was first made under the authority of the British government," I deny in toto. The coasts of Oregon were first explored by the Spaniards, who, in 1774 and 1775, landed there in many places, and "took possession" for their sovereign, before they had been seen by the people of any other civilized nation; and the first settlement made in any part of the regions now known as Oregon, was that of the Spaniards at Nootka, in May, 1789. The next in point of time were those of the Americans, on the Columbia, in 1809, and the subsequent years to 1814. The earliest British settlements west of the Rocky mountains, were made in 1806, in the region north of Oregon. The "taking possession" by the Spaniards, and afterwards by the British, was, as I have termed it in my history, "an empty pageant, securing no real rights to those by whom, or in whose names, it was performed;" but the priority in this point belongs to the Spaniards. The settlements at Nootka and Astoria were meant to be permanent; they did not prove so, any more than those made in old times, at Babylon, Palmyra, or Thebes.

3. Here I have only to leave Mr. Falconer to reconcile, as he can, his assertion, that the British government had a right "to instruct Vancouver to take possession" of Oregon, (which the British government, however, did not do,) with the terms of the convention of the Ecceurial—which was binding at that time on both Great Britain and Spain.

4. I did complain that Mr. Falconer had entirely misquoted the passage in my history relative to the northern boundary of Louisiana; and I do now complain that he has, in his postscript, left it to be inferred that he did not misquote "the last lines," of which he now speaks. Those last lines he presented between quotation marks, in words totally different from mine; and, although they referred specially to the condition and limits of Louisiana in 1800, he made them the object of an argument relative to the condition of things in 1763. Under these circumstances, I am fully authorized to suppose that the variation was not accidental, and that the omission was made with an object. In his postscript he has, however, acted directly and evidently without candor. I never said that "Louisiana extended indefinitely northward," at any time. On the contrary, I have proved in my history that it was bounded, in that direction, by the Hudson's Bay territories. I showed that its boundaries on the east were defined by the treaty of 1763; and that, on the north and northwest, they were *undefined*—that is, they had not been defined by any agreement between the parties interested.

Mr. Falconer could not possibly be mistaken as to the difference between what I said, and what he represents me as having said. That Louisiana did not extend indefinitely to the north, no reasons were required from Mr. Falconer to prove; and those adduced by him are, unfortunately, all either irrelevant or unfounded. Louisiana was not partly formed out of the province of Canada; it was made subordinate to the government of Canada in 1712; but in 1717 it became an independent government, and continued so as long as France held possession of it. No one ever doubted that Louisiana did not extend further north than the Illinois, or that all north of the Illinois, and south of the Hudson's Bay territory, formed part of Canada. But the Illinois lies east of the Mississippi; while the question was exclusively confined by me to the regions north and northwest of that river; and in 1763, when the Mississippi was made the dividing line between the British and French possessions, "all the territory north and northwest of its source remained a portion of the Hudson's Bay territories," as it had been ever since 1669, agreeably to many treaties between France and Great Britain. Mr. Falconer would scarcely succeed in convincing Sir Henry Pelly, or Sir George Simpson, or any other member of the Hudson's Bay Company, that the territories of the Red river, the Assinaboin, the Saskatchewan, and the Athabasca had ever formed part of Canada.

With regard to the map cited by Mr. Falconer, on the authority of M. de Moiras, as proving incontrovertibly that Canada, in 1757, extended to the Pacific, and as containing the course of a river in all