

boundary disputes, there is, except for scanty references in local works, nothing by any New Brunswicker; while the history of the Quebec, of the Nova Scotia, of the County and Parish Boundaries, has hitherto been entirely unwritten. Most important of works relating to our boundaries is unquestionably Professor J. B. Moore's "History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a party," which treats so fully and judiciously all of the International boundary controversies in which New Brunswick has been concerned, as to well-nigh exhaust that subject from the general point of view. Next to this come the summaries in Winsor's America, invaluable bibliographically and cartographically, but not always immaculate in statement of minor facts. Of much value too are the recently published Winslow Papers, with their scholarly annotations, the most important volume which has yet appeared upon New Brunswick history. These few works represent one, but a very valuable one, of three classes of literature relating to our boundaries, the other two of which include respectively the original charters and other documents on the one hand and the partizan comments upon the other. As to the original documents, I have referred to them often in the text. As to the partizan comments, I have for the most part left them out of attention, as containing nothing new and as being rather of psychological than of historical interest. One may read Washburn's discussion from the American side, and Weatherbe's from the British without being any the wiser as to the merits of the boundary questions, and these are but representatives of an immense literature which is quite negligible in studies whose first aim is to get at the actual facts of a subject.

While I have tried to cover the ground of my subject with some fulness and proportion, I am aware that the study is in many points deficient, and there are some minor points, especially relating to the earlier boundaries, still needing investigation. I am not sure that all the statements in my summary of the parish boundaries are correct, for I have not myself had access to the Acts after 1836, though I hope the errors are few. I have been able to clear up some points of local interest, but among them are two or three of much wider importance. Thus I have been able to prove that the St. Croix of Mitchell's map is not the Magaguadavic as American writers claim to this day, but is really the present St. Croix, and hence that, from every point of view, the decision of the commission in 1798 was perfectly just and correct. Further I have shown that in all probability the western source of the St. Croix of the Alexander Charter and later documents was really the western source of the northern or Chiputneticook branch and not of