

er still? The position that the arrival of Captain Meares from Macao, supply them, when they should depart." This under the latter shows, at that period, there was no claim a right to restore territorial rights by the party who made the pre-British subjects' new settlement of Meares.

Narrative, says a new association for the fur trade was formed, with the In at Macao, which changed the plan of Meares, readily consented he did not return to the coast of America, but, his territory, where agent of the association, he gave instructions the accommo- the vessels it sent out. From these, as attached "In return" his Memorial, it is evident that there was an air of pistols. tion to make an establishment on the north- the grant was east coast of America, but at what point does not it all doubt is appear; nor is there a word about the purchased of the interview acts of land at Nootka Sound, but that point is following he ferred to thus: "We recommend you, if possi- says, "As a bribe, to form a treaty with the various chiefs, par- t, he was promulgarly at Nootka."

coast he should Captain Colnett, of the ship *Argonaut*, (under e house, and all the colors,) was the first, who, sailing with e instructions, arrived at Nootka. He found

specific object, a Spanish officer, Martinez, in possession of that e "spot of ground," and informed him of his intention to erect a e extructs; and British fort on shore. This Martinez resisted as he bought the invasion of his sovereign's right; an altercation od by the prom allowed, which resulted in the arrest of Colnett atels, how can the seizure of his vessel. Afterwards, the his Memorial, Princess Royal," consort of the "Argonaut," o tracts of land arriving at the same port, was also seized and taken or the equally a prize. This transaction was the subject of a s, that the chief message (May 5th, 1790) from the King of Great are as their sertain to its Parliament, and formed the basis of ought no land the negotiations which led to the Nootka Sound permission to convention. Though the message of the King is abundant in complains of the capture of vessels, the seizure of as, according to goers, and the imprisonment of crews; though, n nations, such the commencement, the point to be discussed ed nothing agreed to be the distinction between the right of overy, it is use exclusive occupation, and the right of exclusive sue it. overignty, navigation, and commerce; the terri-

Meares at Nootka instinct of Great Britain was aroused by the ns Gray and In negotiation. The claim for redress because of ves- (1788) before it's captured and cargoes seized, closed with a submitted by treaty, the first article of which, was for the res- a house, or ration to British subjects of buildings and tracts osts, covered y land. To this size, even then, had grown the at this Capt. Do spot of ground," and the fur traders' hut erect- s and commanded for a temporary shelter.

s before sailing. Since 1826, the British negotiators have rested year." If, then, their claim upon the Nootka Sound convention; session in default they have not informed the world to what ex- blow up discover that claim may go, or on what basis it now of "the hut" ests. Our Secretary of State, (Mr. Calhoun,) abandoned. The 20th September, 1844, in a letter to the British wiving year, (1788), Minister, (Mr. Pakenham,) asked the reason for ire into trespass assumptions from the Nootka convention. It Majesty. He said to be regretted that the reasons have not been ctions to make fully given. That "spot of ground is so expan- rival at that place," that it were well to fix some limit to its e "Iphigenia" growth.

she had returned Mr. Chairman, the first article of this Nootka Islands. She convention provides for the restoration of "build- (Viana,) Captains and tracts of land situated on the northwest of supercargo, coast of America," or on the adjacent islands, of under the Porchigh British subjects "were dispossessed about e papers. M the month of April, 1789." The reference is to anchor in a p the transaction at Nootka Sound; and I believe it Spain; and has been sufficiently proven, that when the Span- in, being in dish officer arrived, there were no buildings at the re in daily ex place, that no tracts of land were claimed by Brit-

ish subjects, and therefore that the article was void.

The second article provides for compensation for the losses sustained by acts of violence. This was fulfilled by the payment of the sum agreed on—\$210,000—and which probably much surpassed any loss sustained.

The third article gives to the subjects of both the contracting parties the right to land on the coast of the Pacific or South sea, "in places not already occupied, for the purpose of carrying on their commerce with the natives of the country, or of making settlements there," subject to the restrictions in the following articles.

Among the restrictions, the only one having an important bearing on the right to make settlements, is in the fifth article, which limits those settlements to the coast and adjacent islands "situate to the north of the coast already occupied by Spain." This treaty was formed in 1790. In 1789, Spain settled Nootka; therefore, the joint right of settlement was north of this point. Then, sir, the question arises: what extent of ground did the Spanish settlement cover? The established usage is, that settlement on any part of an island, is considered as extending to the whole. The line, if this be correct, which forms the southern limit of the British right to make settlements under the Nootka convention, is to be drawn through the head of Quadra and Vancouver's Island.

Mr. Chairman, accustomed to believe that British subjects had no right to settle, except for purposes of fur trade, in the region of Astoria and its dependencies; that it was sheer assumption on their part to claim authority to make permanent settlements in southern Oregon; I listened with much surprise to the gentleman who yesterday construed the claim as extending to the whole coast down to Mexico. British diplomatists are seldom barred by modesty from asking for enough; but this construction surpasses any they have ever made, and, if correct, would greatly modify my opinions on our present policy. I have endeavored to construe the Nootka convention by its terms; now, sir, I will refer to its history, as illustrative of the object the British negotiators had in view. In what part of the coast of northwestern America had British subjects sought to trade? The publication of Cook's voyages originally attracted British enterprise to the American coast of the north Pacific. Cook first landed at Nootka, and his examinations were thence northward. The British adventurers in the fur trade followed in his track. To show that they neither engaged in, nor valued the trade south of that point, I will read another passage from "Dixon's Voyage round the World." Attached to his journal is a condensed history of the fur trade, as it existed two years before the Nootka treaty. Page 321, he says: "From this short sketch of the fur trade, thou mayest easily perceive that many great advantages would be derived from it, if placed on a permanent footing; to effect which, I should conceive the most eligible plan would be to establish a factory on the coast; and the north end of Queen Charlotte's island seems peculiarly well adapted for that purpose; the situation is nearly central, between Cook's river and King George's Sound; and we are well assured that the furs to the southward are of a very inferior quality." The region, then,