

is the territory of the United States, and I know not well how we can prevent it, without resorting to violence, unless, indeed, it were accomplished by overrunning the island with British settlers. San Juan is a fertile and beautiful island, with a large extent of open prairie land; but were it barren and rocky, and intrinsically worthless, it is of the utmost value to Great Britain, commanding, as it does, the channel of communication between Vancouver's Island and British Columbia. Let the words of the Treaty be perverted as they may, I do not think it possible, under any circumstances—unless the Treaty be put aside, and the testimony of Messrs. Mc Lane and Benton be substituted in its place—that the line of boundary can be directed into the Canal de Haro; and so long as it does not pass through the Canal de Haro, the Island of San Juan cannot be possessed by the United States. In my opinion it matters not if all the other islands between San Juan and the continent pass to the United States, but San Juan is invaluable to our possessions; it is clearly ours both in right and in equity, and to yield it to the United States would be to depreciate our contiguous territory to an extent that, some day, might prove fatal to Her Majesty's possessions in this quarter of the globe.

5. Before concluding, I would remark that I have returned no other answer to Mr. Campbell's last communication (Inclosure 2) than a simple acknowledgment. The correspondence was evidently originated for a purpose, and its continuance could in no way forward the object of the Commission. Mr. Campbell designates my reply to his inquiries as to him "circumlocutory" and "evasive." I am content that he should deem it so, and his having so expressed himself confirms me in the opinion I had formed of the object he had in view. That my reply was not satisfactory to him, and was not what he desired, I can very well understand, and, indeed, is no more than I expected; to say that it did not afford him sufficient practical information is mere nonsense. He knew I had referred the disputed question to my Government, and he knew that I awaited further instructions respecting my proceedings on that head. I informed him I had not received those instructions, nor was I aware when I should receive them. What other information could he, in reason and common sense, desire as a reply to his inquiry? If he wished me to co-operate with him upon any point, it was competent for him to call upon me for such co-operation openly and directly, but it was not for me to take the initiative without instructions, after all my conciliatory attempts to conclude matters had been treated by him, throughout, with the most stubborn disregard,

I have, &c.
(Signed) JAMES C. PREVOST

Inclosure 1 in No. 4.

Mr. Campbell to Captain Prevost, R.N.

*United States' North-West Boundary Commission,
Camp, Semiahmoo, June 7, 1859.*

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, in reply to mine of the 18th.

The object of my letter as stated therein was "to request you to inform me whether I am to expect any further communication from you in regard to the determination of the water-boundary, and, if so, at what period of time I may probably look for such communication."

In reply thereto, you say, "I beg to acquaint you that I have not received any instructions from my Government upon the subject of the reference made by me on account of the contrary views entertained by us, nor am I aware when it is probable that I may receive instructions."

As your reply does not contain the information I asked for, I have the honour again to call your attention to my inquiries, and very respectfully to request an explicit answer thereto.

I have, &c.
(Signed) ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL,
United States' Commissioner.