

River Mississippi, to the south, gave to Great Britain all the lands on the east bank of the river, and secured to France and through it to Spain, the territory west of the same line. But the territory of Canada north of the source of that river, (47° 10' N. L.) and north of a line, running west of the source of the river, was left as a part of Canada, of which it most indisputably formed a portion."

Mr. Falconer here places his meaning beyond question. Has he ever read the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company? Certainly not, or he would never have made this assertion. That charter was granted by King Charles the Second in 1669; it conveys to the Hudson's Bay Company in full possession, and almost in sovereignty, "all those seas, straits, and bays, rivers, lakes, creeks and sounds, in whatsoever latitude they shall be, that lie within the entrance of the Straits, commonly called Hudson's Straits, together with all the lands, countries, and territories, upon the coast and confines of the seas, straits, bays, lakes, rivers, creeks, and sounds aforesaid, which are not actually possessed by any of our subjects, or by the subjects of any other Christian prince or state." The right to these waters and territories was maintained by Great Britain in her wars with France, and was confirmed in the treaty of Utrecht, and in all subsequent treaties between those powers relative to territories in America so long as France held any possessions on the northern continent. The territories thus granted to the Hudson's Bay Company extend west of the Mississippi, and south of the latitude of the sources of that river, and they were always claimed and used by that body until 1818, when the 49th parallel of latitude was adopted by convention between Great Britain and the United States, as the dividing line between their possessions in that part of America. Until the conclusion of that convention, the northern boundaries of Louisiana remained *undefined* — that is, undetermined by accord of the parties interested, as I prove clearly in my pages 281 and 436.

Will Mr. Falconer now maintain that the territories, thus granted to the Hudson's Bay Company in 1669, most indisputably formed a portion of Canada, and therefore belonged to France until 1762? If not, his whole theory as to the western extension of Canada falls to the ground. Does he not see, moreover, that if his argument be admitted, by the same rule Louisiana must also necessarily have extended to the Pacific, embracing the whole lower portion and the mouth of the Columbia, which his government is now so anxious to secure?

What "*the official map used by France, in its negotiations with Great Britain,*" was, we are to learn from M. Duflot de Mofras. On referring to the quotation from that author, we see, first that, "*All the old maps,* in fact, in accordance with the authors most worthy of credit, carry the limits of the French possessions of Canada to the South Sea." \*

It is needless to waste time on such an assertion; the erroneousness of which, is shown by every old atlas. The "*author most worthy of credit,*" cited by M. de Mofras, is L'Escarbot, in whose history of New France, printed in 1617, after the settlement of Florida, New Mexico, Virginia and the New Netherlands, the whole of the American continent and

\* "*Toutes les anciennes cartes, en effet d'accord avec les auteurs les plus avérés n'arrêtent qu'à la mer du Sud, la limite des possessions Françaises du Canada.*"