

officers during all the years I was in daily intercourse with them ever hint at a doubt as to the boundary from which Russian claims started.

Second. I have known lawbreakers to escape to Tongass from justice, being, while there, out of the jurisdiction of British Columbia.

Third. When the United States purchased Alaska, a corps of soldiers was stationed at Tongass and continued there for years in undisputed control.

Fourth. On my migrating with over 800 Indians from British Columbia in 1887, we had to call at Fort Tongass and give an account of our belongings. I paid the customs officers over \$1,000 to bring my goods into Alaska. The customs authorities resided at Tongass, just over the inlet called Portland Canal.

Yours, truly,

WM. DUNCAN.

J. B. METCALFE, Esq., *Seattle, Wash.*

METLAKAHTLA, ALASKA, May 31, 1895.

DEAR SIR: Since the report reached us of the controversy which is going on between Canada and the United States concerning the boundary line between British Columbia and Alaska, we have met to discuss the matter.

The information which we have to offer on the subject is:

First. When we left our old home in British Columbia we were regarded as foreigners by the Canadian authorities.

Second. In the summer of 1887, when we migrated to Alaska, Fort Tongass, just over Portland Inlet, was a port of entry. We had to pay duty to a custom-house officer residing there on all dutiable articles we brought over to this country.

Third. We employed three small steamers to convey over our belongings, one of which the custom-house officer at Port Simpson tried to detain as coming from a foreign country. We had to receive our clearance papers at Port Simpson before coming over to Alaska.

Fourth. Having got over to Annette Island, the Canadian Indian agent at Metlakatla, British Columbia, ceased to have any control over us, which would not have been the case (such was the animus of the man) if the boundary line had been doubtful.

We remain, truly yours,

THE PEOPLE OF METLAKAHTLA, ALASKA,
D. LEASK, *Secretary.*

J. B. METCALFE, Esq., *Seattle, Wash.*

Sixth. That the Rev. Mr. Duncan, having become engaged in a controversy with his religious superiors sent out to overlook his charge of the Metlakatla Indians, appealed to the Congress of the United States for a haven for himself and his 800 Indians away from their control or molestation, and that by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891 (chapter 501, section 15, United States Statutes at Large, volume 26, page 1101), Annette Island was set aside for his use. The new Metlakatla is now a thriving community, with churches and schools, and self-sustaining industries carried on by these Indians, and that Canada had not at that time announced the present claim or any claim to this island.

Seventh. That it can be shown that the process of the British Columbia courts were never attempted to be served on the north side of Portland Canal on offenders against British Columbia laws.

Eighth. That it is conceded by the press, and also officials of British Columbia, that some one has blundered and that the official maps of that province, recognized by Canada, have to be "corrected," and say that "the Dominion officials have followed, sheep like, in the track of the United States diplomatists. Luckily, their stupidity in lazily copying the blunder of the public servants of the United States did not legalize what is manifestly an error. It is not too late to correct the mistake that has been made." The utterance of Premier Turner is to the same effect, "The Canadians will have to repudiate some of their own maps."

The foregoing references are made to show that the facts therein set forth reasonably constitute a tacit admission by Canada of the proprietorship of the United States in the now contested territory, since during all the time mentioned the open and well-known possession thereof and the exercise of governmental control over the same by the United States has never been, until recently, assailed nor questioned.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1825.

The committee has heretofore alluded to what appears to be an illogical construction given to the terms of Article III and IV of the convention of 1825, which are identical with those of Article I of the convention of 1807, wherein the description of the boundary line is recited. A careful perusal of