

dominion over the unoccupied parts of the American continent.

He says, as to continuity, "it may more properly be considered as demonstrating the greater degree of interest which the United States possesses, by reason of contiguous, or requiring territory in that direction, than as affecting, in any way, the question of right."

He acknowledges that Spain conveyed, by the treaty of 1810, all the rights she had the power to dispose of north of 43 degrees; but he could not, by that transaction, invalidate the rights which she had, by a previous transaction, acknowledged to belong to another power; and the treaty of 1790, acknowledged in Great Britain certain rights.

With respect to the claims urged for Heceta and Gray, to the discovery of the Columbia, (both verified in the United States, be it remembered,) he says they conflict; but allowing them both to be vested in the United States, if Heceta's claim be good, then Great Britain has a joint claim by the treaty of 1790.

He then proceeds to a consideration of the British claim, says, the United States had no claim when they became a nation, and that those of France, were worth nothing; urges the commercial intercourse of Great Britain with the Northwest coast, the voyages of Cook, the discoveries of Meares, and survey of the coast and islands by Vancouver; and says that, by these Great Britain has as strong a claim by discovery and exploration as could be imagined.

He sets the accuracy and authenticity of Cook's and Vancouver's survey against the discoveries of the mouth of the Columbia, by Gray.

On exploration, he says, that Mackenzie, a British subject, crossed the Rocky mountains to the Pacific, in 1793, and discovered the upper waters of Frazier's river, which, in process of time, was traced down to near latitude 49, and this he puts near Custerpoan, to Lewis and Clark's discovery of the upper waters of the Columbia. In 1811 he says,

Briary of settlements, he says, amounts to a trading post in 1811, which has not been occupied by the Americans since its surrender after the war, and, in 1812, to 1814, counterpoan, to the declaration of Lord Castlereagh, to Mr. Rush, he puts that, Col. Cleburne's despatch, to the British Minister at Washington at the time of giving up Astoria claiming the whole territory from the Columbia to the sea.

He says, that the state of the question is, that the parties are in joint occupancy, and Great Britain can only be divested of her right to that joint occupancy, by an equitable partition of the whole, between the two powers.

He says, Great Britain, in adhering to the line of the Columbia, "is not influenced by motives of ambition with respect to the boundary, but, by considerations of utility, not to my necessity, which cannot be lost sight of," &c.

On the 20th of September, 1844, Mr.

Cahoun, refers to this statement of Mr.

Buchanan, and concludes, by asserting our clear

title to the whole territory drained by the Columbia River.

Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Cahoun.

WASHINGTON, 15th January, 1845.—

Says that he has sent all that has passed

heretofore to her Majesty's Government,

and that they have it under consideration;

but, in the mean time, he is instructed to propose arbitration, leaving the choice of arbitrators to be subsequently determined upon.

Mr. Cahoun to Mr. Pakenham.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1845.—

States that he has laid his proposal before

the President, and is instructed to inform him that, "he cannot accede to the offer."

Moving all other reasons for declining

the offer, sufficient to state, that he continues to entertain the hope, that the question may be settled by the negotiation now pending between the two countries; and that, he is of the opinion, it would be unavoidable to entertain a proposal to resort to any other mode, so long as there is a hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement by negotiation; and especially to one which might rather retard than expedite its final adjustment.

Mr. Buchanan to Mr. Pakenham.

WASHINGTON, July 12, 1845.—

The Secretary of State resumes the negotiations, and proceeds, in reply to Mr. Pakenham's note of September 12, to answer his request for a proposition from the United States Government, and also for a statement of title. He commences with the Rio Bravo for its boundary, to renounce also New Mexico and parts of Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas. The paper appeals to the citizens and to the army, not to tolerate so iniquitous a treaty. Mr. Parrott is denounced in the most ignominious terms, and Berger called an arrant traitor for entering into any terms with him whatever.

The Amigo goes on to say, that on the 29th of October, the Minister of Foreign Affairs prevented himself to the Chambers in secret session, and had the effrontery to read to them letters from the American Consul at Vera Cruz and Mexico, to which a note of Commodore Conner was quoted, which announced that the squadron under his command was withdrawn from Sacrificios, in consideration that the Mexican Government had agreed to receive an Envoy from the United States, who would arrive for the purpose of settling the boundary between the two countries. And, says the Amigo, "the ignominy of a Minister had the audacious impudence to congratulate the Chambers and the country upon the auspicious event!" Thus it follows up with a violent appeal to the people to come to the rescue, to rally under the cry of "Union and War! War and Liberty!"

Having established these positions, he states, the positions which he considers

Mr. Pakenham has proved, of our right to

the whole of the territory, drained by the

Columbia, and maintains, that, the idea

of joint occupancy, specially exempt

this title from being impaired by them, or

any subsequent action of Great Britain. Our own title is older than that acquired by the Florida treaty; and admitting the application of the Nootka Convention, it sought to be enforced by Great Britain, it cannot affect our title to this territory, than as affecting, in any way, the question of right."

He acknowledges that Spain conveyed, by the treaty of 1810, all the rights she had the power to dispose of north of 43 degrees; but she could not, by that transaction, invalidate the rights which she had, by a previous transaction, acknowledged to belong to another power; and the treaty of 1790, acknowledged in Great Britain certain rights.

With respect to the claims urged for

Heceta and Gray, to the discovery of the

Columbia, (both verified in the United

States, be it remembered,) he says they

conflict; but allowing them both to be

vested in the United States, if Heceta's

claim be good, then Great Britain has a

joint claim by the treaty of 1790.

He then proceeds to a consideration of

the British claim, says, the United States

had no claim when they became a nation,

and that those of France, were worth nothing;

urges the commercial intercourse of

Great Britain with the Northwest coast,

the voyages of Cook, the discoveries of

Meares, and survey of the coast and islands

by Vancouver; and says that, by these

Great Britain has as strong a claim by

discovery and exploration as could be

imagined.

He sets the accuracy and authenticity of

Cook's and Vancouver's survey against

the discoveries of the mouth of the Co

lumbia, by Gray.

On exploration, he says, that Mackenzie,

a British subject, crossed the Rocky

mountains to the Pacific, in 1793, and

discovered the upper waters of Frazier's

river, which, in process of time, was

traced down to near latitude 49, and this

he puts near Custerpoan, to Lewis and

Clark's discovery of the upper waters of

the Columbia.

In 1811 he says,

Briary of settlements, he says, amounts to

a trading post in 1811, which has not

been occupied by the Americans since its

surrender after the war, and, in 1812, to 1814,

counterpoan, to the declaration of Lord

Castlereagh, to Mr. Rush, he puts that,

Col. Cleburne's despatch, to the British

Minister at Washington at the time of

giving up Astoria claiming the whole ter-

itory from the Columbia to the sea.

Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Cahoun.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 30, 1845.—Mr.

B. proceeds to reply, at great length, to

Mr. Pakenham's statement, and quotes

the despatch of Major Jackson and

Addington, on the 16th December, 1826.

He says, Great Britain, in adhering to

the line of the Columbia, "is not influ-

enced by motives of ambition with respect

to the boundary, but, by considera-

tions of utility, not to my necessity, which

cannot be lost sight of," &c.

On the 20th of September, 1844, Mr.

Cahoun, refers to this statement of Mr.

Buchanan, and concludes, by asserting our clear

title to the whole territory drained by the

Columbia River.

Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Cahoun.

WASHINGTON, 15th January, 1845.—

Says that he has sent all that has passed

heretofore to her Majesty's Government,

and that they have it under consideration;

but, in the mean time, he is instructed to propose arbitration, leaving the choice of arbitrators to be subsequently determined upon.

Mr. Cahoun to Mr. Pakenham.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1845.—

States that he has laid his proposal before

the President, and is instructed to inform him that, "he cannot accede to the offer."

Moving all other reasons for declining

the offer, sufficient to state, that he continues to entertain the hope, that the question may be settled by the negotiation now pending between the two countries; and that, he is of the opinion, it would be unavoidable to entertain a proposal to resort to any other mode, so long as there is a hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement by negotiation; and especially to one which might rather retard than expedite its final adjustment.

Mr. Buchanan to Mr. Pakenham.

WASHINGTON, July 12, 1845.—

The Secretary of State resumes the negotiations, and proceeds, in reply to Mr. Pakenham's note of September 12, to answer his request for a proposition from the United States Government, and also for a statement of title. He commences with the Rio Bravo for its boundary, to renounce also New Mexico and parts of Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas. The paper appeals to the citizens and to the army, not to tolerate so iniquitous a treaty. Mr. Parrott is denounced in the most ignominious terms, and Berger called an arrant traitor for entering into any terms with him whatever.

The Amigo goes on to say, that on the 29th of October, the Minister of Foreign Affairs prevented himself to the Chambers in secret session, and had the effrontery to read to them letters from the American Consul at Vera Cruz and Mexico, to which a note of Commodore Conner was quoted, which announced that the squadron under his command was withdrawn from Sacrificios, in consideration that the Mexican Government had agreed to receive an Envoy from the United States, who would arrive for the purpose of settling the boundary between the two countries. And, says the Amigo, "the ignominy of a Minister had the audacious impudence to congratulate the Chambers and the country upon the auspicious event!" Thus it follows up with a violent appeal to the people to come to the rescue, to rally under the cry of "Union and War! War and Liberty!"

Having established these positions, he states, the positions which he considers

Mr. Pakenham has proved, of our right to

the whole of the territory, drained by the

Columbia, and maintains, that, the idea

of joint occupancy, specially exempt

this title from being impaired by them, or

any subsequent action of Great Britain.

He then proceeds to a consideration of

the British claim, says, the United States

had no claim when they became a nation,

and that those of France, were worth nothing;

urges the commercial intercourse of

Great Britain with the Northwest coast,

the voyages of Cook, the discoveries of

Meares, and survey of the coast and islands

by Vancouver; and says that, by these

Great Britain has as strong a claim by

discovery and exploration as could be

imagined.

He sets the accuracy and authenticity of

Cook's and Vancouver's survey against

the discoveries of the mouth of the Co

lumbia, by Gray.

On exploration, he says, that Mackenzie,

a British subject, crossed the Rocky

mountains to the Pacific, in 1793, and

discovered the upper waters of Frazier's

river, which, in process of time, was

traced down to near latitude 49, and this

he puts near Custerpoan, to Lewis and

Clark's discovery of the upper waters of

the Columbia.

In 1811 he says,

Briary of settlements, he says, amounts to

a trading post in 1811,