

respects identical with the Columbia, and which Mr. Falconer was pleased to regard as the official map employed by the plenipotentiaries of France and Great Britain in 1762,—I showed that it was drawn and presented by the French commissaries appointed under the treaty of 1748, with the object of exposing the extravagant pretensions of the British in America; and that it contained no river entering the Pacific from the interior of America near the 46th degree of latitude, (as expressly asserted by M. de Mofras,) nor any allusion to Canada, or New France, nor any sign whatever of French dominion in America; while, on the contrary, the whole division of the continent, from sea to sea, between the 40th and the 48th parallels of latitude—including, of course, nearly all Canada—appears on it as New England. My assertions were specific, and were either true or false. Mr. Falconer should have plainly admitted them or denied them; but, instead of this, he quibbles again. "Mr. Greenhow," he says, "appears to assert that this map relates to the negotiations of 1748. The dates do not confirm this view of the case," &c. Does he mean that the map specially mentioned by M. de Mofras was not presented by the French commissaries appointed under the treaty of 1748? that it was the map used by the plenipotentiaries in 1762? that it does contain a river which corresponds in any respect with the Columbia? and that it tends to prove that Canada extended to the Pacific?

5. Mr. Falconer declared in his book, that "it is not honorable, while the title to the territory is undetermined between the respective governments, to urge measures to *populate* it with American citizens, in order to give facilities for its occupation at a future period." On this point, I showed, by reference to the published correspondence between the Hudson's Bay Company and the British government, that the company, in 1838, "claimed and received the aid and consideration of government for their energy and success in expelling the Americans from the Columbia regions, and forming settlements there, by means of which they were rapidly converting Oregon into a British colony." This, says Mr. Falconer, is no reply; and he then shifts the question to one about the settlement of the dispute by the agency of forcible and hostile operations. Whether such operations have been authorized by the British government, we know not; they may be ordered and carried into effect in virtue of a single despatch from the Colonial Office. In the United States, none such could be executed, or even ordered, until they had been discussed and approved in Congress.

Mr. Falconer has, however, most positively and

improperly misrepresented my views, and imputed to me dishonorable motives, in the latter part of the same paragraph. I assert that "the true policy of the American government should be, by all lawful means, to resist the extension of European dominion in America, and to confine its limits and abridge its duration wherever it may actually exist." This, Mr. Falconer is pleased to interpret as an assertion that "regard for public rights ought not to form a portion of the policy of the American government;" and he asks, in conclusion: "Can that be lawfully abridged, which lawfully belongs to a foreign government?" Has Mr. Falconer not heard of treaties, of purchases or cessions of territories in exchange for other advantages? Are these not lawful means of abridging the limits and the duration of a dominion? Finally, may not a nation lawfully resort to war for such purposes, when it considers its own safety threatened by its neighbors?

Mr. Falconer may, with perfect safety, represent my answer as *feeble*, as relating to *immaterial matters*, and as displaying a *discourteous and intemperate spirit*; whilst he well knows that it will be seen by very few of those who read his reply to it in England. The terms of that reply have doubtless been based on this consideration, or he would not have ventured to misrepresent my statements, as he has here done, in every particular. If he is, as he professes to be, strengthened in the belief of the correctness of his views by my answer, he will probably not have made any alterations in the edition of his pamphlet, to which this postscript is annexed; but will have sent it forth to the world with the quotation from Bradford's history as a stipulation in the Louisiana treaty; with the charges of treachery and bad faith against the United States, based on that pretended stipulation; and with the assertion that the map produced by the French commissaries in 1757, shows the course of the Columbia, and proves that Canada extended to the Pacific: in return for which, he will doubtless receive the approval of the members of his government, and the newspapers of London will compliment him on his triumphant vindication of his first positions.

While such liberties are taken by British historians, with regard to subjects on which accurate information may be so easily obtained, and errors so easily detected, what reliance can be placed in their accounts of expeditions to Afghanistan, and embassies to Ethiopia, where they may represent the circumstances as they please, without fear of contradiction?

ROBERT GREENHOW.

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1845.