

ment by direct and special orders, from their government, before any attempts for the same purpose had been made there by the people of any other nation; and that no authority on the part of the British government was alleged by the claimants of Nootka Sound, whose cause was supported by that power in 1790, at the risk of a war with Spain. Equally careful is Mr. Falconer, to omit all the material arguments adduced by me, with regard — to the controversy between Vancouver and the Spanish Commissioner at Nootka, in 1792 — to the examinations of the Columbia and the adjacent coasts, by Gray, and by the British navigators — to the American settlements on the Columbia, and — to the pretended reservation of right by the British government, on restoring those settlements in 1815. On all these points I have nothing to change in the accounts presented in my history. Mr. Falconer's note on his page 93, so far as I can unravel its meaning, for it is rendered somewhat doubtful by omissions, is as direct and positive misrepresentation of my views, as expressed in page 281 of the history to which it refers.

At page 85, Mr. Falconer writes: "On the north and north-western boundary of the United States, 'Louisiana, it is said, stretched from the Gulf of Mexico, to the northward and north-westward, to an undefined extent.' (Greenhow, p. 276.) It can be most distinctly demonstrated, that there is not the slightest foundation for this statement."

Now in the first place Mr. Falconer has entirely misquoted my expressions. Specially referring to the state of things at the commencement of this century, I say "the territories of the United States were at that time, all included between the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and the Mississippi river on the west. In the north were the British Provinces; in the west lay Florida belonging to Spain; and beyond the Mississippi the Spaniards claimed the vast region, called Louisiana, stretching from the Gulf of Mexico, northward and north-westward to an undefined extent." These observations, I repeat, refer only to the state of things in 1800, when Louisiana embraced no territory east of the Mississippi, except New Orleans and its vicinity; and nothing which I have seen has induced me to doubt their entire accuracy.

His conclusions on the subject are thus summed up in page 87: "First then, as a subordinate province partly formed out of Canada, Louisiana extended no farther than the distinct boundaries of it could be shown; secondly, it never extended further north than the Illinois river; thirdly, the question of the extent of Louisiana was argued at the peace of 1762; fourthly, Canada in its full extent was ceded to Great Britain; and, lastly, the official map used by France in its negotiations with Great Britain, incontestably proves, that the country north and north-west of the Mississippi was ceded as the Province of Canada. No better authority for the above statement can be cited, than M. Duflet de Mofras, a gentleman attached to the French legation at Mexico, and the author of a work on California, published by order of the French Government — to avoid the possibility of misinterpretation, his own words cited."

Of these conclusions it will be necessary to examine only the last, to which the others are subordinate; it is thus farther explained by Mr. Falconer. "By the seventh article of this cession" [the treaty of 1763 between France and Great Britain] "the line drawn from the source of the