

prevented him from perceiving that I have discussed the question as one of public importance, and not as a private affair, in which he has any personal interest. I am not responsible for the defects of his history or the deficiencies of his argument. I assumed that he made the best statement his case enabled him to do, and I cited his book with every desire to do so fairly, notwithstanding his charges to the contrary, as less open to contradiction than any other authority which I could produce.

Two articles have lately appeared on this subject, the one in the 'Foreign Quarterly Review,' (No. 70) and the other in the 'Edinburgh Review.' The former is written with great ability, and gives a very complete and admirable statement of the history and of the arguments of the case. The latter, which is an enlargement of an article which was previously printed in the 'Examiner' newspaper, contains some singular inferences, which have not met with the assent of persons who have examined this question. Nor is this surprising, for the author, in order to establish his inferences, has rejected the most important and indisputable facts; a very unusual mode of dealing with evidence in this country.

The writer of the article in the 'Examiner' thus refers to the events which followed the Convention of the Escorial, which, adopting to the new American expression, he says, is called the "*Nootka Sound Convention*:"—

"The northernmost point then occupied by Spain was Port San Francisco, in lat. 38°. Next year, Capt. Vancouver was sent by the English Government with instructions to receive the surrender of Nootka Sound, and to explore the north-west coast. On his way out Vancouver committed one of the most remarkable pieces of maritime diplomacy on record. He took exclusive possession, in the name of the King of England, of the whole territory from lat. 39° 20', to the Straits of St Juan de Fuca, in lat. 48°. That is to say, the Treaty having stipulated that the whole coast north of the Spanish possessions should be open to the settlement of the subjects of both nations, he quietly seized, in the name of the King of England, more than two-thirds of the habitable part of it. It does not appear that any attempt was ever made to act on this absurd assumption of sovereignty. A large portion of the territory comprehended by it, that between 39° 20' and 42°, is now under the undisturbed sovereignty of Mexico.

In referring to the same events in the 'Edinburgh Review,' they are thus spoken of:—

"During his voyage, we trust without instructions, Vancouver was guilty of an assumption of sovereignty more ridiculous than even the average absurdity of such transactions. He first took possession, in the name of England, of all the country from lat. 39° 20' to the Straits of Fuca, and afterwards from the Straits of Fuca to the 59th parallel. That is to say, the Treaty, to superintend the execution of which he was dispatched, having stipulated that the whole coast should be open to settlement by England and Spain, he took exclusive possession of nearly the whole of it on the part of England. We are glad to think that no British negotiator has relied on this assertion of claim. Indeed, the northern part of the territory comprised in it is now under the undisputed sovereignty of Russia, and the southern under that of Mexico."

So far from the proceedings of Vancouver being ridiculous, they were necessary and proper, and perfectly in conformity with the