

A good deal of weight is attached by General Foster to the argument drawn from the maps published since the treaty of 1825, the boundary line shown on many of which accords with or goes beyond the contentions of the United States. It is, however, easy to over-estimate the value of such evidence. Some of these maps are almost grotesque in the extreme claims they make, and evidently have been prepared without adequate knowledge of the treaty. Great allowance must, of course, be made for the cartographers. No surveys other than those of Vancouver were undertaken of the shores of the Lynn Canal till after the year 1880, while the mountain ranges along the coast were not surveyed till the year 1895, after the Convention of 1892 had provided for a joint international survey. As the treaty of 1825, which defines the boundary line, makes its location dependent upon alternative circumstances, the occurrence or non-occurrence of mountains running in a direction parallel with the coast, it must be plain that any line placed upon a map before a survey was made, or a knowledge of the existence of such mountains ascertained, cannot be held to establish anything. It is fair to assume that such boundaries were intended by the draughtsman only as an indication of the occurrence of a dividing line somewhere in that region, and later cartographers, in the absence of any further knowledge, simply adopted the location of the line as they found it on earlier maps. The whole country was a veritable *terra incognita* until recent years, with intermittent communication, scant population, and, comparatively speaking, little or no commerce beyond the trade in furs. Under these circumstances the Canadian Government feel that little weight should be attached to maps showing the location of the line incorrectly and inconsistently with the treaty, as appears in the fuller light of subsequent surveys.

The Americans largely rely upon certain acts of occupation by them within the *lisière* to establish their claim to the territory in dispute. The argument drawn therefrom would have more force if Great Britain denied the right of the United States to any *lisière* at all. But this she does not do. Nobody disputes the claim of the United States to a strip of the coast. The point at issue relates to the extent of this strip. Actual possession at many different points no doubt took place, and political control was exercised all along the *lisière* both by Russia and the United States, but the question 'What is the *lisière*?' remains unaffected by this admission. It is therefore beside the mark to assert, as