

better adapted to the growing of that kind of grain than any other; but then you may depend upon it, it is no better, for example, than north Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin or Missouri. I hope you will not misunderstand me. I am only comparing Oregon with this country, with the view of answering your question. It is a fine country, but in my opinion not superior to this. Nor am I to be understood as aiming to discourage emigration to that country. I would rather encourage it, and say nothing that would cast a damper over the feelings of the emigrant, and cause him to abandon his purpose.

In answer to your question about the soil of Missouri, I reply, that it is as fertile as that of any country. I mean the river bottom land. The prairie (table) land is not so rich, and on that account the first settlements were made in the timber, which is pretty much confined to the water courses. For the last few years, the river lands have not been valued so high, from the fact that they are liable to be overflowed once a year. The larger class of rivers in this State rise in the Rocky Mountains, and every spring they are swelled to an enormous size from the melting of the snow in those mountains. This is called the June rise, and at that season of the year can do a great deal of injury. On this account, the earlier settlers of this State, who located themselves on the bottom lands, have generally moved up on the high lands; that is, upon the prairies, where their crops are not exposed to the danger of being swept away every spring. You have read the various accounts in the newspapers, of the great flood of 1844 in our rivers, which go to strengthen what I have said.

Another advantage which the prairies have, is, they are healthier than the bottom, timbered lands. They are higher, and being destitute of timber to interrupt the currents of air