

position, and there is no occasion to measure 10 marine leagues from the coast. If, on the other hand, the conditions are such that the second paragraph of Article IV is to be applied, then the line is to run "parallel to the windings of the coast;" this would make the line run across the mountains, and not "on the summit."

It is considered worth while to discuss a part of the Report of Professor W. H. Dall to ex-Secretary of State Mr. T. F. Bayard. That Professor Dall is probably the best informed man on North-western Alaska is admitted, but this does not establish him as an authority on South-eastern Alaska—say from Lynn Canal down to Portland Channel.

An examination of the Annual Reports of the United States' Coast Survey, with which Professor Dall was connected from 1871 to September 1884, fails to show that he ever did any work on or along the mainland in South-eastern Alaska. His farthest explorations and works south on the mainland were north of Cross Sound.

His having been engaged for nearly nine years exploring and surveying the Territory by no means establishes a knowledge of some particular and limited area under discussion. When it is remembered that Alaska covers something like 500,000 square miles of wilderness, the probability of the foregoing assertion becomes apparent.

Professor Dall is an eminent scientist, but his authority on South-eastern Alaska cannot be admitted as conclusive.

Professor Dall says: "We have no good topographical Maps of this part of Alaska, but, having been engaged nearly nine years exploring and surveying the Territory, I assert, without fear of contradiction, that nothing of the sort" (depicted by Vancouver) "exists. We have, instead, what has been aptly called 'a sea of mountains,' composed of short ranges with endless ramifications, their general trend being parallel with the general curve of North-western America, but, so far as their local parts are concerned, irregular, broken, and tumultuous to the last degree. In certain places, as from Cape Spencer to Yakutat Bay, we have the nearest approach to such a range, but even here are broad valleys, penetrating an unknown distance, and lateral spurs given off in many directions. These Alps rise conspicuously above their fellows, but to the eastward another peculiarity of the topography is that the hills or summits are nearly uniform in height, without dominating crests and few higher peaks.

"The single continuous range being non-existent, if we attempt to decide on the 'summit' of the mountains we are at once plunged into a sea of uncertainty. Shall we take the ridge of the hill nearest the beaches? This would give us, in many places, a mere strip of territory not more than 3 miles wide, meandering in every direction. Shall we take the highest summits of the general mass of the coast ranges? Then we must determine the height of many thousands of scattered peaks, after which the question will arise between every pair of equal height and those nearest to them. Shall we skip this way or that, with our zigzag, impossible to survey except at fabulous expense and half-a-century of labour? These peaks are densely clothed with trees and deep soft moss and thorny underbrush, as impenetrable and luxuriant as the savannahs of Panamá. In short, the 'summit of the mountains' is wholly impracticable."

It is rather striking that the Professor avoids using the words of the Convention, "the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast."

It would have been instructive to learn from him whether or not mountains exist which are "situated parallel to the coast." He says—the single continuous range being non-existent—this introduces a discussion what a "range" is, and what a "single continuous range" is, words which do not appear in the Convention at all, and hence are not warranted when the definitive words, "mountains situated parallel to the coast," are given.

"Shall we take the ridge of the hill nearest the beaches? This would give us in many places a mere strip of territory not more than 3 miles wide, meandering in every direction."

The extensive quotations from the P.C.P. and from personal observations fail to elicit many "ridges of hills nearest the beaches," but instead, the mountains rise abruptly from the water's edge. The manner in which Professor Dall states, "This would give us in many places a mere strip of territory not more than 3 miles wide," cannot but impress one that such a strip is inconsistent with the terms of the Convention. Not at all.

The gist of Russia's claim was control of as much sea-shore as possible for the purpose of trading, and not land; and, in accordance with this dominant idea, the Convention was framed.