

selves against charges of wrong administration, and anything he might have said would not be much evidence in this case. However, whatever it may be, Mr. Moore thinks it of "perhaps more significance than any map."

I do not agree with him; on the contrary, well-authenticated maps would be of the greatest importance; and it is only fair to ask those who have been looking up evidence, Where is that map marked yellow of which Sir George Simpson speaks? and where are all the other maps used at the making of the treaty? At first I did not think any were used, but upon closer examination and careful reading of the correspondence, I find several spoken of.

The treaty itself was signed at St. Petersburg on the 28th of February, 1825. As I understand it, there was only one copy, and that in French, which was so executed. An approved translation in English was obtained and taken by the British Ambassador to England. All the rest of the papers were left in the archives at St. Petersburg. These muniments of title, including the papers, are now somewhere, and should without much difficulty be produced. And, more particularly, the maps, which cannot be reached as books on the subject can, should without delay be (if they are not now) lodged in some public place where they can be consulted. Prof. Moore, who speaks with great positiveness about maps, and their being acknowledged by both England and Russia, might give valuable assistance. When at Sitka and other parts of Alaska last year I tried to get information on the subject, but was unable to do so:

It is interesting to note the points of similarity between this controversy and what is known as the Venezuela arbitration. In the Venezuela case there was really only one question to determine, namely, the boundary line between the colony of British Guiana and the United States of Venezuela. In all, there are fourteen articles in the treaty of arbitration: only one in regard to the question in dispute, the other thirteen descriptive of the rules to be followed and the power of the court. The treaty of arbitration was signed in February, 1897; well on to three years expired during the consideration of the question, and before making an award. It was said at the time that the only fair way to determine a boundary question was by arbitration. Both England and America were loud in exclaiming that a boundary dispute, above all others, should be determined by a board of arbitrators. In the Alaskan boundary dispute there is also only one question to determine, namely, the boundary line between Alaska and British America.

The *New York Times*, a well-conducted paper, speaking of the Venezuela award, says, in part: "To be courageously consistent