

bers from the south, who were touched by his earnest appeals and thought Wisconsin would have an abundance of land left, after allowing the St. Croix valley to be taken out of the state. But the majority were against the project and voted down the amendments as fast as Brownell and his friends would offer them. Even the proviso of the previous convention was promptly defeated, and the Rum-river proviso finally passed, forty-six to twelve.

The convention adjourned on the 1st of February, 1848, and the constitution was forwarded to congress for approval. The boundary proviso which it contained, at once raised a storm among the people in the St. Croix valley and about Fort Snelling, who wanted to be included in Minnesota. They accordingly united in a memorial to congress protesting against the Rum-river proposition, which memorial was presented on the 28th of March.¹ The petitioners — among whom were H. H. Sibley, Henry M. Rice, Franklin Steele, William R. Marshall² and others who afterwards became prominent in Minnesota affairs — wrote:

“Your memorialists conceive it to be the intention of your honorable bodies so to divide the present Territory of Wisconsin as to form two states nearly equal in size, as well as other respects. A line drawn due south from Shagwamigan [Chequamegon] bay, on Lake Superior, to the intersection of the main Chippeway river, and from thence down the middle of said stream to its *debouchure* into the Mississippi, would seem to your memorialists a very proper and equitable division, which, while it would secure to Wisconsin a portion of the Lake Superior shore, would also afford to Minnesota some countervailing advantages. But if the northern line should be changed, as suggested by the convention, Minnesota would not have a single point on the Mississippi below the falls of St. Anthony, which is the limit of steam-boat navigation. This alone, to the apprehension of your memorialists, would be a good and sufficient reason why the mouth of Rum river should not be the

¹ Neill's *Minnesota* (ed. 1882), p. 489.

² See Marshall's reminiscences of this boundary dispute, in *Mag. West. Hist.*, vii., pp. 248-250.