

# The Dominion Illustrated.

\$4.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

THE DOMINION ILLUSTRATED PUBLISHING COMPANY (Limited), Publishers,

GEORGE E. DESBARATS, MANAGER,

73 St. James Street, Montreal.

GEORGE E. MACRAE, WESTERN AGENT,

36 King Street East, Toronto.

J. H. BROWNLEE, BRANDON,

Agent for Manitoba and the North West Provinces.

London (England) Agency:

JOHN HADDON & CO.,

3 & 4 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C.

SOLE AGENTS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

7th SEPTEMBER, 1889.



Mr. Morris Moss, owner of the Black Diamond, has, through Mr. Prior, M.P., it appears, made representations to the Dominion authorities to the effect that Ounalaska and others of the Aleutian Islands are below the parallel named in the Treaty of 1824, as the extreme southern boundary of the Russian possessions in America. According to the treaty in question, the Island of Prince of Wales was to belong wholly to Russia. Then, commencing from the southernmost point in that island (said point lying in the parallel of 54 deg. 40 min. north latitude), the boundary line was to ascend northward along the Portland Channel till it struck the 56th deg. of north latitude. From there the line of demarcation was to follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude, from which point the meridian of 141 degrees was to form the limit between the Russian and British possessions as far as the shores of the Frozen Ocean.

We are not aware, however, that this convention as to the demarcation of British and Russian territory was ever regarded as affecting Russia's claim to the Aleutian Islands, which is supposed to rest on the discovery of Behring. They were taken possession of by the agents of the Czar in 1745. The fur trade (that in seal and sea otter especially) proved a fruitful source of gain to the Russians, who sold them at first mainly in the Chinese market. In later years, as the Siberian fur-bearing animals grew more and more scarce, the demand for the products both of sea and land increased, and eventually the Russians made good their footing on the American continent. That there should arise competition for the spoil was only to be expected. British, Spanish and American vessels sought a share in the traffic; but the Russians, having the great advantage of a foothold on both the Asiatic and American shores, were able to establish their supremacy.

That they had, at one time, extended their operations as far southward as to bring them into direct conflict with the Spaniards, is evident from the name of the Russian river which enters the sea in Mendocino County, California. The Russians once had a settlement on Bodega Bay, opposite Mount Helena, and on the summit of the mountain itself, which they called Moyacino, they had set up an inscription on a tablet of copper to indicate the line of boundary that Russia then claimed. The head of the United States and Mexican Boundary Commission, the explorations of which were conducted in the years 1850-53, had, during his visit to the neighbourhood, fallen in with persons who had seen the inscription.

The chain, which extends from the peninsula of Kamtschatka to that of Alaska, properly consists of three groups—the Aleutian or Rocky Islands, the Andreanoff and the Fox Islands. The whole archipelago lies between the 52nd and the 55th degrees of north latitude, and thus some of the islands are clearly south of the line designated in the boundary treaty. The question is whether articles 3 and 4 of that document refer merely to the coast and interior, or embrace also the insular portion of the territory transferred to the United States in 1867. Mr. Moss's theory is a novel one, as the right of Russia to the entire chain of islets has never before, we believe, been disputed, the clauses of the treaty that mention 54 deg. 40 min. as the southern limit of Russia's possessions being interpreted as having to do with the coast and interior only. It remains to be seen whether the view which would assign those clauses a larger significance will be seriously entertained by the British and Canadian Governments.

Reference was made in our last issue to an important article on "Canada, its National Development and Destiny," that appeared in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*. It was unavoidable, in view of the actual state of opinion in England and the Colonies, that the author should pronounce some judgment on the subject of Imperial Federation, as it concerns the Dominion. The conclusions that he has reached are expressed in these terms: "1. That the Canadians will accept no scheme which may in any way whatever weaken the admirable system of Federal Government and of Provincial freedom which Canada possesses under her present Constitution. 2. That Canadians hesitate to entrust the arrangements of her financial or fiscal policy to any Parliamentary body in which the representation will be necessarily small and her influence consequently insignificant. 3. That a million or more French-Canadian people look suspiciously on a scheme of Federation which may curtail their privileges and bring them under the control of an Imperial Parliament, in which their peculiar interests may be jeopardised and their identity as a distinct race eventually lost." The passage just quoted is, we believe, a fair statement of the attitude of the bulk of our population (including the educated and thoughtful portion of it) on the subject, and we agree with the writer, Dr. Bourinot, that it cannot be considered favourable to the proposed scheme. At the same time there is a very general feeling that any movement that would tend to ensure the integrity of the Empire, while guarding the cherished privilege of freedom from any outside control, is worthy of encouragement. We are not surprised to learn, therefore, from the same authority that the promoters of Imperial Federation are making steady headway.

Even the British press is beginning to resent the arrogance of those tourists who, after hurried visits to a country—visits that permit of only superficial observation of its people and its resources—deem themselves qualified to deliver judgment *ex cathedra* concerning all that pertains to it. In these days when any one who has means and time to spare can traverse continents and oceans with ease and safety, and when it is no rare thing to meet with intelligent men who have made acquaintance with people of every race, colour and tongue in their native climes, it is folly to write books of travels that are merely transcripts of the published experiences of previous wayfarers. Only after a

prolonged stay amid the scenes that he would describe and careful studies of exceptionally interesting features in the scenery, products, trade, politics or society, should one take the responsibility of increasing the burden of the booksellers' shelves with new volumes of travel. For works like those of Darwin's "Voyage of the Beagle," Bates's "Naturalist on the Amazon," or those of Livingstone and Stanley, Kinglake, Curzon and Prime, there will always be readers (and of such works there is no lack); but, for the publication of bare records of locomotion and of sights seen in passing along not unfamiliar routes there is no justification whatever. And when, as sometimes happens, such *crambe repetita* has neither charm of style nor the merit of trustworthy narrative, it is not surprising that critic and public should lose patience under the infliction. The most dangerous of such books, however, are those which are inaccurate and prejudiced, and at the same time attractively written.

Though Canada has suffered at different times from both these classes of misrepresentation, it has, on the whole, less reason to complain than some of the sister colonies. The Australian provinces, South Africa and the West Indies have all in turn protested against the inexact accounts of tourists who would pose as authorities. The Cape is the latest complainant, the offender being a noble traveller who spent some six weeks in the country. In commenting on some of his misapprehensions, *Imperial Federation* gives the following piece of advice: "That our public men should travel and see with their own eyes the Greater Britain beyond the seas is unquestionably desirable. Perhaps it is also desirable that, as a rule, they should confine themselves to seeing, and write as little as may be when they get home again." This advice would certainly be profitably followed in some instances; but, on the other hand, we cannot be too grateful to visitors whose interest in our welfare is undisputed and who take pains to learn the truth about us and deal fairly with us. To writers of this category Canada owes not a little, and among them we would mention with special respect the names of Dr. Tanner and of Mr. Dyke, who are now paying the Dominion a visit.

Mr. Dyke, who is the agent of the Dominion Government at Liverpool, and who has been in the public service of Canada for more than twenty years, has always shown himself a sincere and judicious friend of this country. His share in providing settlers for the North-West has not been small, some of the most flourishing colonies having been originally organized through his efforts. It was he, too, who induced the farmers' delegates from the United Kingdom, whose observations and conclusions form an instructive volume, to proceed to the North-West. He has also done much by pen and tongue to promote trade between Europe and Canada, and the latter's success at the Antwerp Exhibition was largely due to his exertions.

Professor Tanner, selections from whose writings we have lately placed before our readers, has been one of the most earnest advocates in Great Britain of North-Western colonization. His essays on Canadian agriculture have been accepted as standard authorities on the subject. He has a vigorous and agreeable style, and his pamphlets abound in various information. He is at present in Canada in connection with a Colonization Company, in which Lord Brassey is interested.

Of the distinctive features of the present age there is not one that has compelled more attention