

contains anything that merits the distinction may apply it there.

This summit line would divide the island, and perhaps, under the operation of a ten league limit, leave it uncertain if the southern points of the island were ceded to Russia. It was very immaterial to Britain, under the proposed conditions of possession, if Russia occupied the whole island or not. The method adopted was the simplest, but the change made it necessary to define a fresh starting point for the artificial part of the line. It had been on the coast of the *terre ferme*, it only required the erasure from the map of the part of the line dividing the island, and the substitution in the text of the treaty of *continent*, instead of *terre ferme*. It makes no practical difference if this point is upon the coast of Prince of Wales Island, or if the parallel of latitude is intersected further to the west, because the boundary is here governed entirely by the mountain summits and the ten league limit.

Had the writer from the first, known the view held by Sir Wilfrid Laurier of the immemorial nature of Russian rights in Alaska, it would have simplified the study of the case presented by Canada to the Tribunal. This view proves too much ; in the first place, that the title was just as good before the Russian Empire was in existence as it has been at any time since. And next, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier must have agreed to the Washington Convention of Jan. 1903, with the deliberate purpose of surrendering to the United States the territory to which he supposed they were justly entitled ; but in such a manner as would relieve himself and party of the political responsibility of having done so. The United States Government must have entered into this Convention with a conviction that they were asked to take part in a farce, the motive of which was to "save the face" of Canadians, and allow them to back out of an untenable position with a minimum loss of self esteem. That under such conditions the Commissioners should have been asked to subscribe an oath to judicially consider the questions presented to them, appears to show no more respect to the sanctity that should attend an oath