

political control of these points, and established custom houses, post offices, and other evidences of authority. With such reasonable diligence as the extreme difficulties of access to this territory and other circumstances permitted, Canada protested against this cavalier mode of solving the difficulty, and urged the desirability of establishing the boundary line as contemplated by the Convention of 1892.

It is commonly asserted by the advocates of the United States' contention that Great Britain's claim to the heads of inlets is an afterthought—never dreamed of until the gold discoveries in 1897 drew attention to the advantages of ready means of access to the Yukon country. General Foster, indeed, goes somewhat farther, and intimates that it was not until the International Commission assembled at Quebec in August 1898 that he and his colleagues became aware of any divergence of view between the two Governments respecting the interpretation of the treaty of 1825.

It is somewhat surprising that an American statesman, and an ex-Secretary of State to boot, should commit himself to a statement so easy of disproof. More than ten years ago the United States Government issued a document* containing letters by Dr. George Dawson (an eminent Canadian authority, who had been summoned to Washington for a conference on the boundary) in support of the Canadian contention as to the line crossing inlets, and also a counter-argument by Mr. Dall, the American expert. Accompanying this report is a map showing how the boundary would run in accordance with the views presented by Dr. Dawson. On this map the line is clearly marked as crossing the Lynn Canal in the vicinity of Berner's Bay. It is also a matter of common knowledge to those in Canada who take interest in this question that on several occasions, both before and after the publication in 1889 of the American Blue-book referred to above, the Dominion authorities protested against arbitrary attempts on the part of the United States to settle the question conformably to its own pretensions.

While the foregoing presentation of the Alaska boundary question is admittedly from the British point of view, it is by no means desired to convey the impression that the facts and the arguments are all one way. On the letter of the treaty the British side have, we think, a decided advantage,

* Senate 50th Congress, 2nd Session, Ex doc. No. 146, pp. 4-9. Map No. 16.