

"take possession;" and he reported the fact to his Government. The Government approved of what he had done; his report of what he did was published by order of the Government; and the British Government confirmed what he did and asserted public rights in consequence.

The right of our Government to take possession of Oregon was perfectly reconcilable with the Convention of the Escorial. The British Government did not then contemplate the folly, introduced in the discussions with the Government of the United States, of having a *joint occupancy* of the country with Spain—a state of things in which no law could be administered. The Convention merely recognized the right of both countries—as a right common to both—to make settlements, under the control of their respective Governments. The extent of territory with which any settlement should be actually connected depended on its locality, and the rules applicable to the extent of territory which might be claimed in connection with it, have been laid down by the American Government in its correspondence with Don Louis de Onis. In the first instance, it was necessary that the British Government should ascertain what part of the coast was waste, abandoned, or unoccupied, in order to ascertain where it was lawful to make settlements, and to prevent any conflict with Spanish authorities. This duty was performed by Vancouver, who took possession under the authority of his Government of the abandoned and waste territory. After this was done, it still remained open to the Government to regulate any settlement which might be made, to define its limits, and to abandon, by distinct orders, what part of the territory it pleased, or impliedly to abandon it by not planting any settlement. Such proceedings were perfectly consistent with the Convention of the Escorial. By that agreement no right of sovereignty over the territory we might occupy was to be abandoned. Subsequently the settlement on the Columbia was made. It was sanctioned and approved of by the British Government; and it was the first settlement made on that part of the coast that received the sanction and authority of any Government. But if the British Government had not "taken possession" of the country, the Hudson's Bay Company could not have had jurisdiction in it. Their authority can only be exercised within the limits of that territory over which the Crown has declared its sovereignty to extend.

Fourthly, Mr Greenhow asserts, that I misquoted him in citing a passage from his 'History' respecting the northern limits of Louisiana. I reply, that he has no ground for the complaint. "The Spaniards," he said, "claimed the vast region called Louisiana, stretching from the Gulf of Mexico northward and north-westward to an undefined extent;" but he now adds:—

"I never said that Louisiana extended indefinitely northward at any time. On the contrary, I have proved that it was bounded in that direction by the Hudson Bay territories. I showed that its boundaries on the east were defined by the Treaty of 1763, and that on the north and north-west, they were *undefined*—that is, that 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 to have said. That Louisiana did not extend indefinitely to the north, no reasons were required from Mr Falconer to prove; and those