

contention, that such a possession of the mouth of a main stream, gave them jurisdiction over its entire watershed in the interior, just as their possession of the outlet of the St. Lawrence gave to France the control of its entire basin. Upon this principle, Louis XIV. had made his concession to Crozat for monopolizing the trade of the great valley.

These two grounds of national rights, the one arising from the possession of the coast and the other from occupation of a river-mouth, were consequently at variance with each other. They were both in themselves preposterous, in the opinions of adversaries, and both claimants were forced to abate their pretensions. The English eventually conceded to France all west of the Mississippi. France by the arbitrament of war yielded, to one people or another, the water-sheds of both the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence, just as the United States at a later day, making a like claim for the entire valley of the Columbia River through the discovery of its mouth, were forced to be content with but a portion of their demand.

There was another difference in the claims of the two contestants, which particularly affected their respective relations with the original occupants of the Great Valley.

The French asserted possession against the heathen, but cared little for his territory except to preserve it for the fur trade. They were not, consequently, despoilers of the savages' hunting-grounds. One to three square miles was estimated as each Indian's requirement for the chase. On the other hand, they seized such points as they wished, without thought of recompensing the savage owners. This prerogative of free appropriation, the French persistently guarded. When, in 1751, La Jonquière told the tribes on the Ohio, that the French would not occupy their lands without their permission, he was rebuked by his home government and Duquesne, his successor, was enjoined to undo the impression, which La Jonquière had conveyed to the savages.