

non est. Add to this *entirely* the fact that in 1818 or 1819 a boundary line along Portland Canal appeared in a Russian atlas. The Hudson Bay Co. having the whole frontier in their lease from Russia, evaded any special notice being taken of the circumstance of placing the boundary line along Portland Canal, and so the matter remained until the purchase of Alaska by the United States in 1867.

The perusal of M. de Baer's statements at Washington in connection with the *Chas* would not lead one to expect that he would scruple at a small thing in carrying an official point. I must say, however, that in my researches in the official correspondence prior to the signing of the Treaty I have failed to find any statement which could be construed into the slightest change of the project of the convention as transmitted by the Right Hon. G. Canning to Sir C. Bagot, and endorsed by him in his "Statement D."

I am very truly

Your most obedient servant,

ALEXANDER BEGG,
C. C. & H.

No. 32.

Further Explanations.

Extract from a letter to H. F. Wilson, Esq., Private Secretary to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, dated Wick, 10th February, 1896.

"There is one point to which I wish to refer particularly, and that is the strategic position involved in the frontier of British Columbia, approached through Dixon Entrance from the Pacific Ocean to Port Simpson, the nearest open winter harbour to Japan and China on the western frontier. This will be more clearly exemplified by consulting the sketch plan marked 'E,' formerly handed to Mr. Wyld, of the Foreign Office. No one denies the strong position and excellence of L'Anse-au-Loup Harbour, the British naval station at the southeastern end of Vancouver Island; yet there are good judges who think it would be an advantage were a second naval station established in the north, at or near Port Simpson, having command of the inland waters of Naas River, Observatory Inlet, and Portland Canal, but which would be lost to the Crown of Great Britain if the *assumed* United States Boundary be permitted along Portland Canal.

"More than seventy years ago Russia coveted this desirable location and made strenuous efforts to secure it in the treaty of 1825, but the firmness of the Right Hon. George Canning saved it to the British Crown. During the negotiations with Russia to settle the navigation rights of Great Britain, in opposition to the extravagant claims made under the Russian Treaty of 1824, Sir Charles Bagot was instructed to modify his former proposals, and, instead of Cross Sound and north through Lynn Canal, to make the 56th degree of latitude, along with a strip of land along the coast, the southern limit of Russian occupation on the mainland. (See despatch, March, 1824, and Statement 'D,' already submitted.) In that admirable statement, Sir Charles Bagot effectively disposed of all territorial claims by Russia on the continent south of latitude 60°, inasmuch as they were supposed at that time to have formed any settlement on the mainland, but to meet a claim made by Russian Fur Company for a base of operations on the continent opposite to their establishments on the islands, the limit on the mainland was fixed at 55°, nearly opposite Sitka, which was the most southern establishment occupied by that company in 1825.

"The Russian plenipotentiaries, realising the value of possessing the inland waters of Portland Canal and its strategic position, made strenuous efforts to obtain it. They protracted the negotiations at St. Petersburg from 1823 to 1825; at last (Feb. 16th, 1825) the treaty was signed, without any material change from the line of demarcation laid down in Statement 'D,' by Sir Charles in March, 1824, and corroborated by Mr. George Canning, July 12th, 1824.

"The Russian Fur Company does not appear to have occupied the coast, or made any settlement in that direction farther south than at Fort Wrangel, on an island near the mouth