

remained subject to the French rights which had been transferred to Great Britain. In 1803 the American Government obtained the French title to Louisiana, which, being derived from the same source as the British title to Canada, must be bound by the evidence of French authorities respecting its extent.

The French maps used in 1762, in the official discussions respecting the cession of Canada, are clearly receivable to prove the extent of Canada in opposition to any assertions now set forth to limit its extent and to extend the boundary of Louisiana, though they would not be evidence in favour of a French title in opposition to titles dependant on any origin not French. Such maps are of avail respecting territory on this side of the Rocky Mountains, but beyond these mountains they prove nothing, the French Government having neither discovered nor occupied the territory watered by the rivers flowing into the Pacific.

The importance of these facts is great, if the pernicious and most dangerous doctrine of "contiguity" is to be of any avail in determining the title to any part of Oregon. By conceding to the American Government—and it was an undoubted concession—the territory between the parallels of latitude $47^{\circ} 10'$ and 49° on this side of the mountains, under the Convention of 1818, the British Government ceded no territory within those parallels, west of the mountains. The title by contiguity, as it existed in 1818, is unaffected by the Convention made in that year.

Mr Greenhow is indignant that I do not declare some opinions of M. de Mofras to be true or false, because "his assertions were specific, and were either true or false." He ought to be satisfied with the reply made by me in my former 'Postscript;' and I am quite contented to have shown that my argument was valid and the proofs of it complete, without the aid of M. de Mofras. I am not in the least disposed to term the mistakes Mr Greenhow has committed, falsehoods, or to imitate his example in speaking of a certain article in the 'London Quarterly Review,' as "an article filled with assertions most impudently false" ('History of Oregon,' p. 266 n.). My experience of Washington convinces me that such language would be condemned there, and that it would be erroneous to infer that it prevails in the public departments.

Lastly, in reply to some comments on Mr Greenhow's remark, "That it is the true policy of the American Government, by all lawful means, to resist the extension of European dominion in America, to confine its limits, and to abridge its duration,"—he asks, "Has Mr Falconer not heard of treaties, of purchases, or concessions of territories in exchange for other advantages? Are these not lawful means of abridging the limits and duration of a dominion? Finally, may not a nation lawfully resort to war for such purposes, when it considers its own safety threatened by its neighbours?"

This answer is not official; and it need hardly to be remarked, that it is not the policy of the Government of the United States to seek for a war, though Mr Greenhow explains this to be included in what he means as part of the policy which he recommends; and it certainly forms no part of the policy of the British Government to threaten the safety of the American Federation.

The anxiety of Mr Greenhow to make personal charges has