oath prescribed by the Black Code, the Judge being in turn also sworn in by one of the jurors, as the presiding officer of the tribunal. The prisoner was then arraigned, entered a plea of not guilty, and stated that she was ready for trial. The District Attorney read over the indictment, and explained to the Jury the law of 1811, which makes it the penalty of death for any slave to strike their master, mistress, or any of their children, so as to cause a contusion or shedding blood, also the amendment to the above act passed in 1813 giving the privilege to the jury to commute the punishment to imprisonment at hard labor for life.

The testimony elicited on the part of the prosecution went to show that the slave Pauline was purchased by Peter Rappeneck about two years since from Mr. Francois Rubeau, who owns a plantation a short distance below Natchitoches, in this State, on which Rappeneck had been for some years an overseer. Some two months since, Rappeneck removed to this city, and rented one half of a double dwelling house, No. 52 Bayou Road, from Mr. Isenhart, who occupied the other half. About six weeks since, Rappeneck, who had business to transact in St. Louis, went up the river, leaving his wife, whom he had represented to Isenhart and his daughter to be crazy, and his children, together with upwards of $200 in money, in charge of Pauline, who has proved to be his paramour, and at present claims to be pregnant by him.

Immediately after Rappeneck's departure, Pauline took possession of her mistress' apartments, and removed her and the three children, aged eight, four and two years, to a back cabinet, which she had previously occupied. Mr. Rappeneck who had sufficiently recovered to appear in Court, testified that since her husband's absence, she had been subject to the most cruel and barbarous treatment from her slave, who had beaten her at times with a cane or leather strap, and with her fist and had obtained such a mastery over her that she was afraid if she disclosed to any one her sufferings, that she would take her life. She also testified that she had a knowledge of her husband's intimacy with Pauline, which had caused much ill-feeling between them, and had resulted on several occasions, in her being struck by her husband. Mrs. R. also testified to the cruel manner in which her children had been beaten by Pauline.

The testimony of Mrs. R. was corroborated by a slave named Dinah, who, on or about Christmas, had been employed by Pauline to work by the day in washing clothes. She stated that on the second day after she had been employed, upon Pauline's returning from market, and discovering that a basket was missing from the breakfast table, that she charged the taking of it upon Constance the eldest child, who upon denying the theft was dreadfully beaten with a leathern strap by Pauline, who also tied the child's cloths over her head and caused her to remain for some time in a kneeling position, with her knees resting upon the rough edges of small pieces of brick, which she had broken up for the occasion. In a few days after, she heard Pauline abusing some one in the cabinet, and upon her Pauline leaving the house, she entered the room, and for the first time discovered that there was a person confined there. She raised the musquito bar and inquired if she could render Mrs. R. any assistance but upon receiving no direct answer, Mrs. R. fearing to disclose her situation, she paid no further attention to it. On Saturday, the 13th instant, she again heard Pauline in the cabinet cursing her mistress, calling her opprobius names and telling her if she did not get up and go to work, she would whip her to death, Pauline, at the same time dragging her mistress by the hair out of bed upon the floor, and beating her in the face with her fist. Upon her (Dinah) remonstrating with Pauline, she attempted to close the door of the cabinet upon her, and forced the child Constance to hand her a cane, with which she beat Mrs. R. in a most shocking and cruel manner. The witness on the same day informed a gentleman for whom she was doing some washing, of what had occurred, who on the next day addressed an anonymous letter to the Mayor, which led to the arrest of Pauline and the release of Mrs. R. and her children from their horrid situation. The testimony of the Mayor and Dr. Bernhaud in regard to the condition of the sufferers, was merely a confirmation of the above statements.

Catherine Isenhart who occupied with her father, a part of the same dwelling with Mrs. Rappeneck, testified that the only time she had seen Mrs. R., was a day or two after she had first occupied the house, which was before her husband (Mr. R.) had left for St. Louis. Mr. Rappeneck told her his wife was crazy; had permitted one of their children some years since to starve to death, and that he was compelled to purchase Pauline to attend to his children on that account. He also told her that his wife would hardly ever speak to any person, even unto himself. The witness also testified as to the beating of the child Constance by Pauline on Sunday night. She had frequently heard Pauline curse her mistress, but as she was frequently absent from the house, if she had inflicted blows upon her, it must have been during her absence.

The case was submitted to the Jury without argument who after being instructed by the court, in regard to the law applicable to the case, returned the following verdict:

"We the undersigned, free holders forming the Special Tribunal which was convoked and sworn to try the slave Pauline belonging to Peter Rappeneck, accused *of striking her mistress so as to cause the shedding of blood*, do unanimously find her guilty and agree to sentence and do hereby sentence the said slave Pauline, belonging to Peter Rappeneck, to death, and do hereby unanimously fix and appoint the 21st day of February, 1845, between the hours of 10 A. M., and 2 P. M., as the time when the said sentence of death shall be carried into effect the place of execution to be opposite the Parish Prison. And inasmuch as we are given to understand that the said Pauline is now pregnant, and this sentence could not be carried into execution while she is in that situation, we in such a case, do further unanimously order that said sentence of death shall be executed at the same hour and place on the 28th day of March, 1846."

(Signed) W. C. Duncan, Jiles Prevost, Manuel J. Blasco, Armand Dejean, Victor Benit, J. St. Cyr.

Correspondence of the Nat. Int.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 30, 1845.

Considerable sensation has been produced among our engravers by the news of a discovery, which is not only likely to effect their interests to a great extent but, which, if generally made known, must lead to consequences affecting the paper currency of the civilized world, the importance of which it is hardly possible to exaggerate. I am indebted to Mr. Chapman, the well known artist, for an account of the invention, and a specimen of a plate produced through its agency.

The discovery consists in a process by which an elaborate line engraving of any size may be so accurately copied that there shall be no perceptible difference between the original and the copy; by which an engraving on steel or copper may be produced from an impression of the print—original plate never having been seen by the copyist—and the copied engraving been capable of yielding from ten thousand to twenty thousand impressions. The producer will undertake to supply a Bank of England note so exactly copied that the person who signed and issued it should not be able to swear which was the original and which the copy.

From the specimen in my possession obtained by this process, and which is copied from a proof engraving of the head of the Saviour, from the burin of M. Blanchard, from the painting of Delaroche, I should infer that these claims on the part of the discoverer could be fully substantiated. The most delicate touches are transferred with perfect fidelity, and this after upwards of four thousand impressions from the duplicated plate had been taken. The London publisher of the engraving submitted one of these copies, together with a proof of the original plate, to several artists, painters, and engravers; and the opinion at which they arrived was that, although it was not difficult to distinguish the original from the copy, *they were so thoroughly alike* that any person of practised eye might suppose the two to be from the same plate, the one being merely taken with greater care than the other; they were precisely the same line for line, and touch for touch; and this example completely established the principle. They considered the invention the most wonderful and the most unaccountable that had been made in modern times in connexion with art.

Many guesses have been made as to the mode by which this marvellous process is affected, but as yet without result. The process does not even infer a necessity of injuring the print delivered as a model, which is returned unscathed. The inventor is an Englishman, and an engraver by profession. He has taken out no patent neither does he think it expedient to do so, inasmuch as, if he does, any unprincipled person may at once adopt it, with little probability of the inventor being able to prove that this process has been the medium by which the print has been produced. A friend of the author of the invention says, with justice, "There is no knowing to what extensive changes in legislation it may conduce; for, if any printed or *written* document can be forged with so much ease and certainty as to defy detection, the consequences may be more appalling than we care to anticipate."

The invention embraces the capacity to reproduce any form of letter press, or any quality of print drawing, or lithograph, in an unlimited quantity, in an inconceivably brief space of time. For instance, from a single copy of the Intelligencer plates might be produced in twenty minutes from which impressions could be worked off with the ordinary rapidity of the steam press. The finest and rarest engravings may be reprinted *ad infinitum*; bank notes may be reproduced in fac simile without the slightest point of difference; and last, though not least, books may be reprinted as from stereotypes, in unlimited quantity. Indeed, the various mechanical and other interests affected by this remarkable discovery have not yet been half enumerated.

More Anti-Rent Troubles—Lynching a Sheriff.—The Nothern papers contain accounts of further outrages by the anti-renters of New York. Sheriff Whittaker, of Otsego county, a few days ago, attempted to serve a writ on a man named Harrington, when he was encountered by a body of men, to the number of 25 or 30 disguised as Indians, who stopped his horse, demanded his papers, presented a pistol at his head, and threatened his life, if he failed to obey their wishes. Mr. Whittaker's business not having the least connexion with the anti-rent troubles, he determined to accomplish his duty, but was unable to do so, and after being provoked and insulted to the last degree, he was forcibly rode on a rail, his head tarred, and his boots filled and drawn on, and finally sent away with the injunction that he must never again appear within "their dominions" under pain of death. In Cattaraugus county also the authorities have been resisted, and shots exchanged between a Sheriff's posse and the belligerants, which resulted in the capture of four of the latter.

THAT GREAT FAMILY—A yeoman, named Hyde, living near London, six feet four inches in height, lately died, and was followed to the grave by nine sons the shortest of which was six feet two and a half inches: several being six feet five inches. The average height of the whole was six feet four inches. There are also two strapping daughters belonging to the family.

CONGRESS.

From the Nat. Intelligencer, Feb. 3.

THE NINTH WEEK OF THE SESSION.

The Senate, during the past week, has been chiefly occupied with the bill for the reduction and regulation of postages; the discussion of the details of which has not yet been brought to a close, but cannot last much longer, for other subjects which will require the whole time of that body will soon demand its attention.

Among these subjects is the joint resolution which passed the House of Representatives some days ago for the annexation of Texas to the United States. That resolution was referred on Monday last to the Committee on Foreign Relations, will of course be now soon reported upon and would indeed probably have been earlier reported upon but for the duty which the committee must have been impressed with of giving a deliberate consideration to a proposition of so much consequence coming from the other body.

The House of Representatives, having spent nearly three weeks in legislation for a territory wholly beyond its jurisdiction, occupied the last week mainly in the debate upon a bill to establish a Territorial Government in the Territory of Oregon, of which we are joint occupants with another Power, whose consent to this disposition of the territory it has not been thought necessary to ask; though we presume that no bill will pass the House of Representatives, and we trust certainly not the Senate, without at least such show of regard to our treaty with the other joint occupant as to provide for giving the required year's notice of the proposed cessation of joint occupation. Even with this qualification, the passage of the act not being required by any pressing necessity that we know of either in reference to public interests or to the interest of settlers from the United States, during the actual pendency of a negotiation concerning the adjustment of the fundamental question of title, appears to us to be wholly inexpedient and unadvisable.

Correspondence of the American Rep.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 3, 1845.

SENATE.

Communications were received from the War and Navy Departments.

Mr Choate presented memorials against annexation. Also, one covering French Spoliations, a subject which he said he should call up as soon as the post office bill was disposed of.

A Bomb-Shell! Mr. Porter presented a memorial from citizens of Detroit, Mich., in favor of the Annexation of Canada, for the reading of which he asked. The memorialists examine the question as one of vast political expediency, and refer to the old confederation to show how important our fathers regarded the territory of Canada, &c. &c.

Mr. Foster, of Tenn. raised the question of reception.

Mr. P. expressed his surprise, and demanded the reason.

Mr. Foster viewed the memorial (not designing an imputation upon the honorable Senator who presented it) as a mere mockery, which was intended for no purpose but to bring into odium a measure now before Congress; but more than this, it was a direct attempt to embroil two nations of kindred language and descent in war.

Mr. Porter replied. He was astonished that a question of reception should have been raised upon a memorial, which, as far as he knew, contained nothing of an objectional character, as regarded the rules upon this subject.—Mr. P. then went into the subject pell-mell, & showed how differently our government behaved in reference to the Canada rebellion of '37, from what it did in regard to the Texas revolt of '35. No proclamation was issued by the government in the latter case. If a band of Mexican ruffians had crossed the Sabine and burned a Louisiana steamboat, and murdered a citizen of that State, would the courts of Louisiana have made a McLeod case of it? No, sir, never, never.

After some further discussion, the memorial was laid on the table.

Messages were received from the President and from the House.

Mr. Dayton presented resolutions of the Legislature of N. Y. against Texas annexation.

Mr. Johnson presented those of Louisiana in favor of this measure, if it can be accomplished properly, &c. Mr. J. said he believed with the Legislature, that a majority of the people of Louisiana were in favor of annexation, but whether he should be able to vote for the plan adopted by the House, he could not tell.

Mr. Brown did not know that his colleague intended to say anything upon these resolutions, but as he had, he could not permit his (Mr. J.'s) sentiments to pass for his own. For himself he wished it to be distinctly understood, that now and always, both to the plan of the House, and to every other plan, at all times, and under all circumstances, did he oppose the annexation of Texas. He opposed it as injurious to the best interests of his State. The resolutions of the legislature were broad enough to allow us to follow the dictates of our own judgment, but if they had not been, he, for one, should have claimed and exercised the privilege. He was not aware that a majority of the people of Louisiana favored annexation; he knew not how this had been ascertained. He believed that Mr. Clay had been infamously cheated out of the electoral vote of Louisiana by the leaders of the Democratic party there, and was glad to see that the legislature had ordered an investigation into the matter.

The resolutions were referred to the committee on foreign relations.

Mr. Walker submitted a resolution, which was adopted, appointing a committee of three on the part of the Senate (to be named by the Chair) to join a like number of the House, and settle the time of ascertaining the votes for President.

The Senate then took up the post-office bill.

The amendment to give the franking privilege to members of Congress was rejected by a vote of 24 to 16.

An amendment by Mr. Huntington to allow editors of newspapers, &c., to send their papers and periodicals out of the mail, without incurring penalty, was adopted by a vote of 21 to 18.

A variety of amendments were made to make the bill conform to the last.

On motion of Mr. Barrow the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Wethered reported a bill confirming and assenting to an act of the legislature of Virginia, amending an act in reference to the Chesapeake and Ohio canal.

After a great deal of discussion of the bill and attempts at amendment, all of which failed, the bill, as it came from the Senate, was passed by the following vote—yeas 105, nays 85.

The next subject that was taken up was the Oregon bill. All the amendments adopted in committee of the whole were agreed to, and the bill was finally passed by the following vote: yeas 140, nay 59. The House then, at 3 o'clock, adjourned.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 4, 1845.

SENATE.

The credentials of Reverdy Johnson, Esq., elected Senator from Maryland for six years from the 4th of March next, were presented by Mr. Pearce and put on file.

Mr. White presented sundry resolutions of the State of Indiana, and among them one enjoining upon their Senators to vote for terminating the joint occupancy of Oregon.

Mr. Dix presented a memorial for the annexation of Canada, which was laid on the table.

Mr. Dayton submitted a resolution, which was adopted, calling on the President, if not incompatible with public interest, to inform the Senate if Mr. Duff Green holds any diplomatic station at the Republic of Texas—if so, when he was appointed, what were his instructions, and what is his pay.

Mr. Evans, from the finance committee, reported the sub-treasury bill passed by the House, without amendment, and recommending its indefinite postponement.

The Oregon bill was referred to the special committee already having in charge the same subject.

The various bills heretofore ordered to be engrossed were taken up and passed.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of the post-office bill.

The pending question was upon agreeing to Mr. Ashley's amendment to make up any deficiency in the post office revenue out of the Treasury.

This amendment was debated at some length, and chiefly objected to by Mr. Phelps, who insisted that double was given, in many cases, for carrying the mail that was justifiable. All the mail contractors in Vermont were rich, and he knew of many instances where, if required to take one-third of what they now got, or nothing, they would gladly take the one third. He would not give the post office department a right to lean on the Treasury, because in such case there would be no such thing as enforcing economy.

Mr. Ashley thought it more important to spread intelligence through the country than to make the post office department pay its own expenses.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. Bagby moved an amendment, which was adopted, giving to all deputy postmasters the same compensation in '45 which they had in '44.

The bill was then reported to the Senate, and might have been passed, but a debate sprang up again upon the franking privilege.

Mr. Allen, of Ohio, made a pathetic speech upon the subject, and dwelt forcibly upon the hardship of charging the poor farmer a cent for a Congressional document.

In the midst of Mr. A.'s speech, he gave way to Mr. Archer, who was sick, and wished to make a report on the Texas subject, and return to his lodgings.

The post office bill was then laid aside for a few minutes, and Mr. Archer rose with his hands full of papers, which he sent to the Chair, the same being the report of the Committee, together with all the resolutions and memorials which have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon the annexation, re-annexation, and anti-annexation of Texas.—The report concludes thus: "Resolved, that the joint resolutions passed by the House for the annexation of Texas be rejected."

The report, &c. was ordered to be printed.

Mr. Buchanan said he was in the minority of one on the committee, and at the proper time he should oppose the report, and advocate the passage of the joint resolutions.

The subject was then laid aside, and Mr. Allen continued to thunder away against the abolition of the franking privilege.

When he concluded, Mr. Buchanan rose and expressed a desire to reply at some length, whereupon the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

After the usual time spent in doing nothing, a motion was made by Mr. Tibbatts, of Ky., that the rules should be suspended in order to consider the bill making appropriations for the improvement of harbors. The yeas and nays were called on this motion, and it was rejected, ayes 52, nays 90.

On motion of Mr. Hardin the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole, but did *not* take up the Post Office bill as he desired; on the contrary, the Land bill, heretofore under consideration, was proceeded with.

Mr. Cary, of Me., made a speech in favor of the bill, and was followed by Mr. Thomason, of Ky., on the other side. The debate was continued to a late hour by Messrs. Stewart, of Pa., Payne, Huges, and Jameson, but no final action was had upon the bill.

A resolution was adopted for ending the debate on the Land bill to-morrow at one o'clock.

Mr. Stewart, of Pa. offered an amendment to the Land bill providing for re-enacting the distribution law. He supported the amendment at some length. The Committee having risen, Mr. Slidell, of La., made an explanation in relation to frauds on the Louisiana election. He deemed the statement made yesterday in the Senate by Mr. Barrow, that the vote of the State had been fraudulently obtained for Mr. Polk. He said he would wait for specific charges, and if any should be made that applied to himself personally, they would be personally resented.

After the transaction of some further unimportant business, the House adjourned.

ANNEXATION.—Hon. J. P. KENNEDY's *Speech*. The argument advanced by some of the annexationists that Texas has a rightful claim to admission into our Union under the treaty of 1803, is one of the strangest, and, to our conception, the most preposterous assumption that could be seriously entertained as an argument. The Globe, speaking of the annexation measure which passed the House a few days since says—"The act authorizes to come in as a State; and this realizes at once the stipulations of the treaty of 1803 which bounds the United States to France to perform this very act. The resolution of this day, is, in fact, *nothing more than the execution of Mr. JEFFERSON's treaty, by which the territory of Texas was acquired.* Mr. ADAMS's *treaty of 1819 was an abortion.*"

Now this treaty of 1819, which is thus regarded as a nullity, gives us the only right we possess to the territory of Florida. The speech of our Representative, Mr. KENNEDY, and it is one of the very best speeches which the debate on the annexation question has produced, is clear and cogent on this point. We make an extract from it:

"It is assumed that the Florida treaty was only void so far as it related to the cession or relinquishment of our claim to Texas, but was good in all other points; that is to say, we could not give up Texas, but had a right to hold fast the equivalent which was given for Texas, namely, the territory of Florida; for I have not heard any gentleman contend or assert that our right to Florida was in the least impaired by the failure of power to give an equivalent. I have heard no one assert that Spain, under the circumstances, had any right to claim the *re-annexation* of Florida.

In 1831 we negotiated a treaty of limits with Mexico, and in 1838 a treaty of the same character with Texas; in both of which treaties we stipulated for the Sabine as our southwestern boundary. It is assumed, in the fourth place, that both of these treaties are void.

The whole argument is founded on the idea of an irrevocable guaranty to the inhabitants of Texas in the treaty of 1803.

Sir, I would remark that it is the ordinary provision, either expressed or implied, in every treaty of cession of territory, that the inhabitants of the ceded country should be incorporated with the nation to which they are transferred. They necessarily become citizens or subjects of the new sovereignty; and the effect of every treaty is to stipulate for the protection, the rights, advantages; and immunities of the citizens or subjects of the nation to which they are ceded. This is as strong a stipulation in their favor, when left to necessary implication, as when it is expressed. When France ceded Louisiana to Spain and when Spain retroceded the same territory to France, in the two secret treaties which have never been published, this guaranty in favor of the inhabitants was virtually incorporated into these treaties—perhaps was there in express phrase—just as strongly as it is in the treaty of 1803. If there be any force in the objection, then, the inhabitants of Texas may now claim the first guaranty in their favor, and pronounce all subsequent treaties void with the same justice that is now claimed in their behalf to invalidate the treaties of 1819, 1831 & 1838; so that the treaty of 1803 itself, on this argument, is as nugatory as those which followed it.

In all the treaties which are to be found in the diplomatic history of Europe, whereby cession have been made, this guaranty—as the gentleman and his friends call it—will be discovered, under many forms of stipulation, both express and implied. Let gentlemen examine the treaties from that of Westphalia, in 1648, down to the present time; the treaty of Nimeguen; of Utrecht; the celebrated Barrier treaty of 1715, for settling the barrier of the Netherlands; the Quadruple Alliance in 1718; the treaty of Aix la Chapelle, and a score of others that followed, down to the treaty of Paris in 1763; and, still later, the treaty of Paris, of 30th May, 1814; and they will find the great staple of these treaties to be cessions and retrocessions of States, with every kind of guaranty of protection & incorporation of their inhabitants. How absurd would it be, how singularly would it strike the ear of the civilized world, to hear these several States settling up rights of reannexation founded on the principles asserted in this argument of the advocates of Texas! Who ever before raised the question that these stipulations were guaranties, so potent and permanent in their affect as forever to forestall and prevent subsequent transfers of the same people and territory?

Sir, does not every Government, by its laws and Constitution, give a guaranty quite as strong, to say the least of it, as this supposed guaranty of the treaty, to protect and maintain its citizens or subjects in possession of the rights and advantages belonging to them? Yet I have shown that every Government—even this of ours—may cede away a portion of its territory and people. Is it not asserted here by gentlemen—the very gentlemen who insist on the guaranty—that Texas may cede away all her people? Has she not guarantied to them citizenship and protection? The treaty of 1803 certainly could not give to the inhabitants of Texas more inalienable citizenship in the United States than the people of this Union possess; more inalienable than that possessed by the people of the present Repub-

lic of Texas. Yet we have seen that these are not secure from the incident of an occasional transfer, when sufficient inducement exists to recommend it.

The treaty of 1803 was a good and valid treaty, but it was no better than the treaty of 1819. Much has been said of late to the disadvantage of this latter treaty. Sir, it was a well-considered, wise and profitable treaty to us. It has met with the almost universal approbation of the country. It brought us rich and valuable possessions; it removed from our borders what I may call without meaning a disrespect to those who formerly possessed the ceded territory, neighbors, uncongenial to us, & who might be troublesome. It was a treaty of ample equivalents. It was negotiated by a most popular Administration was approved finally by the unanimous opinion of the Cabinet, and was applauded by the country. Sir, I deem it a matter of some importance to say, further, that it met with the frank and cordial approbation of General Jackson. I mention this, sir, because in these later days it has been found necessary to invoke the potent name of the Old Chief of the Hermitage against the treaty of 1819, that strength may be gathered for this scheme of re-annexation.

This matter has gained a great notoriety in the country from a recent controversy between members of this House, conducted through the public press, in which much stress has been laid upon the imputed hostility of the Hero of New Orleans to the treaty of 1819. He has himself thrown in a word to that debate. I therefore, sir, say, in very explicit terms, that General Jackson, both before and after the final ratification, expressed an unqualified approbation of the treaty; wrote letters to that effect, which are now extant. These letters, sir, can be produced, and if any authentic friend of General Jackson's upon this floor will deny that his opinons were what I have described them, I take upon myself to say these letters doubtless will be produced.

OUR RIGHT TO THE OREGON.

The prominence which the Oregon question has assumed, and the important results which may follow from the present agitation on that subject, make it highly desirable that the facts in relation to it should be familiarly known.

What are our claims to the Oregon territory? What is the extent of them? How are they substantiated?

The main strength of our claim rests upon the cession made by Spain in 1819. The Florida treaty of that year—a treaty which has been so violently denounced of late and declared by Texan partisans to be a nullity—transferred to the United States all the claims of Spain to the country of the Oregon lying North of the 42° North latitude.

The region in question has been claimed at one time or another by Spain, Great Britain, Russia and the United States. The claims of Russia have been settled by treaty & her possessions in that quarter limited to lat. 54° 40' as the Southern boundary.—The claims of Spain have been transferred to the United States, so that the only question now at issue is between our Government and that of Great Britian; and the territory in dispute extends from the line of 42° N. latitude to that of 54° 40'. It stretches along the Pacific about seven hundred and sixty miles from North to South; it is about five hundred miles wide and contains some 360,000 square miles. The Rocky Mountains border it on the East, and separate it from the country watered by the Missouri; on the West it is bounded by the Pacific ocean.

With respect to the fertility of this region there are conflicting accounts. Mr. Wm. Sturgis, of Boston, in a lecture recently delivered by him before the Mercantile Association of that city, gave it as his opinion from personal observation that the soil of the Oregon was not better than that of millions of acres of unsettled land within our territorial limits. The climate however, is milder. During seven winters passed by Mr. Sturgis on that coast, between the fifty-first and fifty-seventh degrees of latitude, he but once saw ice of sufficient thickness to bear a man.

We have remarked that the main strength of our claim to the Oregon rests upon the cession made by Spain in 1819. The Spanish claim was based upon the rights of discovery; and there seems to be no doubt that the ships of Spain were the first to visit and explore the Oregon coast.

The Spaniards, however made no attempt to settle the country. But Spain had her colonies in California and Mexico; and as her ships had coasted along the continent as far north as latitude fifty-five, and that as early as 1592, she regarded the whole expanse of country as one territory and claimed it accordingly. British vessels also visited the coast; it is not pretended, however, that they were the first discoverers. But finding the country unoccupied a British settlement and trading post was established at Nootka Sound by Lieut. Meares sometime within the last half of the last century. This was regarded by Spain as an invasion of her rights, and the post was attacked and captured by the Spaniards in 1790.

Here was the beginning of that conflict of claims which has come down to this day for adjustment. We have succeeded to the rights of Spain, while Great Britain holds her ancient pretensions. And we may here observe that all questions of prior discovery, and in fact all other questions of right to the Oregon, between the contending parties, are merged into one definite issue which forms the starting point of all discussions connected with the present controversy. That definite issue was made up by the treaty of the Escurial, ratified by Spain and Great Britain in 1790; and the stipulation on the point in question was the result of the capture of the post at Nootka Sound by the Spaniards. England demanded restitution and compensation for his alleged aggression; Spain yielded both; and then was formed the agreement respecting their mutual claims which constitutes the basis of the very agreement now existing between our Government and that of great Britain on this identical point.

In order to strengthen the bonds of

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11032-0614.jpg