

It is well known that the head-waters of the Yukon River lie in Canadian territory, and that the prospecting for gold and placer mining is done mostly on that part of the Yukon lying within Canada; and furthermore, that all the supplies used by the prospectors and miners there come from the United States, mostly by steamer up the Yukon, and without paying duty.

Similarly for the goods going into Canada by way of Chilkoot, the usual route taken by prospectors.

From information obtained from a prospector lately from the Yukon there would appear to be not more than 300 miners on the upper part of that river, from which number an approximate idea of the consumption of dutiable goods can be made.

This of course does not take into consideration the goods introduced for barter with the interior Indians.

The loss of the duty at present is perhaps the less objectionable feature of the condition of affairs; the greater and unavoidable one is that the gold is carried out of Canada by Americans and spent in the United States, without Canada deriving any benefit from its mineral resources on the Yukon.

Canadians are practically debarred from access to the Yukon through their own country save by a long and circuitous route from the east.

In the November number of the "Forum" appeared an article on "American Rights in Behring's Sea," by President J. B. Angell, United States' Minister to China in 1880, and one of the late International Fishery Commissioners during President Cleveland's administration. The above article, coming from such a source, warrants consideration and criticism.

After disposing of the Behring's Sea question, the writer briefly discusses the question of determining the boundary between Alaska and British America.

Quoting from the article: "The principal difficulties which have been suggested in determining and marking the boundary are the following: Some of the Canadians have maintained (I am not aware that the British Government has taken such a position) that our Maps do not correctly indicate the initial point of the line at Portland Channel. Their contention is probably without good ground." The wording "that our Maps do not correctly indicate the initial point of the line at Portland Channel" appears somewhat obscure. From one interpretation of this sentence it may be inferred that the initial point of the line of demarcation is at Portland Channel. This interpretation is evidently inadmissible from the wording of the Treaty.

The other construction, and the one probably meant, is that the initial point of that part of the line of demarcation which ascends along Portland Channel is not correctly indicated on the United States' Maps. By this it would appear as if Canadians accepted Portland Channel as shown on the United States' Maps, but maintained "that our Maps do not correctly indicate the initial point of the line at Portland Channel."

This is not the Canadian contention at all. The Canadian contention is that the United States' Maps show the initial point of that part of the line of demarcation which ascends along that arm of the sea known, at the time of the Anglo-Russian Convention, as Portland Channel (or Portland Canal) to be at the entrance of Observatory Inlet. In short, Canada disputes the interpretation given on United States' Maps of Portland Channel of the Convention of 1825.

Continuing: "Again, while the Treaty provides that the 'line shall follow the summit of the mountains,' it is affirmed, and, so far as we know, with probable truthfulness, that the mountains do not form a range, but are so scattered here and there that it is impracticable to make a line that shall comply with the Treaty." It would have been better, for a clear understanding, to have given the above quotation from the Convention to the end of the sentence, "shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast."

"That the mountains do not form a range" is introducing an unnecessary argument, especially when the main question, "Do mountains exist situated parallel to the coast?" is not touched upon at all. It is essential to adhere strictly to the words of the Convention.

The word "range" does not occur in the Convention.

Quoting again from Mr. Angell's article: "Furthermore, suppose it were practicable to run a line on the summit, the coast is so irregular, and so indented with bays, that it may not be easy to agree on the line from which to lay off the ten marine leagues referred to in the second paragraph of Article IV."

The reasoning and chain of connection in this sentence do not appear very clear. If the line runs "on the summit," the irregularity of the coast-line does not affect its