

Some writers in the United States advise against submitting the boundary dispute to Arbitration, because the United States "have nothing to gain and everything to lose;" others because "an adverse decision would greatly lessen for the United States the present and the future value of the Alaska lisière"—a morality which may be illustrated by the maxim, nous avons l'avantage profitons en. And a writer in an English periodical, whose notions of international justice seem equally tainted, has said:—

In asking America to submit the whole question to arbitration, with evenly balanced chances of success or failure, we are asking her to take chances which no democratic Government can afford to take.

One fair inference from these avowals is that international justice and national rectitude are alien principles of action to democratic Governments. Another logical sequence is that a democratic Government may be the party litigant before itself, as judge and jury, and on its own view of its one-sided and untested evidence, may adjudicate against the territorial rights of an unwarned, because a monarchical, though friendly, Government. The mere mention of such inferences should ensure their universal repudiation; for the people of the United States have not, even in their demagogic outbursts against England, lapsed from the principles of international justice and national rectitude which form the warp and web of their political responsibility to other nations, and which have long been consecrated by the homage rendered to Christian ethics in their churches, and enforced by the teachings of moral and political science in their colleges.

Enough has been shewn—by the facts adduced, the doctrines of International law illustrated, the legal difficulties foreshadowed, the discordant interpretations of the Treaty of 1825, the implied admission of the violation of British sovereignty in the proposed condition for Arbitration, and the ever present fact that for nearly thirty-six years neither the United States nor Great Britain can, without the possibility of future challenge, enforce laws, or quiet rights of property, or indicate to their citizens, or subjects, the actual localities where the territorial sovereignty over Alaska ends, and that over Canada begins, within the Disputed Territory,—to convince all fair-minded Statesmen that both nations, in loyalty to the principles of international justice, and national rectitude, and for the profitable and safe pursuit of the commercial enterprises of the inhabitants, and the industrious development of the natural resources of this disputed territory, should agree upon some means of obtaining a final settlement, by the reference of this International Boundary Dispute,