

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH, ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1903.

TWENTY MONTHS IN AN UNKNOWN LAND.

Remarkable Journey in Eastern Equatorial Africa--Six New Tribes and Some Strange Animals Described--A Five-horned Giraffe--A Race of Dwellers in Pre-historic Caves--Daring Explorer Went Through Many Hardships.

The London Chronicle prints an interview with its representative held in London, with Major Powell-Ottton, Northumberland Fusiliers, who has just completed a remarkable journey in Eastern Equatorial Africa, lasting twenty months. For the greater portion of that time he was unaccompanied by any white man, and had to endure great hardships.

The expedition, which is one of the most noteworthy of recent years, has resulted in some thousands of miles of hitherto entirely unknown country being mapped and in the discovery of six new tribes, including a race of so-called magicians. Considerable data have also been collected regarding the cave dwellers of Mount Elgon. Fifty different species of animals have been secured, some of which will probably prove to be new to science. The explorer also succeeded in bringing back some perfect specimens of five-horned giraffes. For several months the expedition was engaged in a region between the Upper Nile, Lake Rudolf, and Lake Victoria, in which no white man had previously set foot.

Major Powell-Ottton said: Accompanied by Mr. F. O. Cobb, I left Mombasa in February, 1902, and got together my caravan of fifty men, including an escort of twenty armed natives. We travelled some 200 miles into the interior, and, leaving the railway at Mbita station, we increased the caravan, and started for Fort Hall, the most remote government station in this direction, on the way encountering many hardships and dangers. For several weeks the expedition marched in a westerly direction across the desert plain of Likipia, toward Lake Barago. The whole region had been devastated by tribal fights and water was very difficult to find. No human beings were met until the foot of the mountain was reached, when a large party of natives, including a number of carrying green bougmas as a sign of friendship, came out and guided us to the government station.

**The Five-horned Giraffe.**  
On reaching Lake Barago Mr. Cobb, as previously arranged, returned to the coast with the supplies and pack animals. While I started off in pursuit of the five-horned giraffe, at first it proved to be a failure, as the animals had gone into the reserve, and I was not permitted to go. Subsequently I succeeded in securing a pair of fully-grown five-horned giraffes, and returned to Barago. One of the caravans was sent through the forest as a messenger to the government station at Mount Sirogi. Here we came upon hun-

dreds of stone enclosures with circular houses, quite unlike anything I have seen in Africa. The place was a hilly wooded area, with no signs of a human being, yet at one time it supported a teeming population of Masai with their immense flocks and herds. A remarkable contrast was afforded us one afternoon as we approached Mount Sirogi, for the desolate and lifeless landscape was suddenly replaced by beautiful meadow land, covered as far as the eye could see with hundreds of zebra, horses and eland.

There was still, however, no sign of human life, but later, while encamped on the shores, the upper floor being approached by a number of natives running down the mountains. These proved to be the Kamasia, who have the worst possible reputation, and we were more than surprised when they proved to be perfectly friendly, and to be the bearers of presents of flour and honey.

**The Cave Dwellers.**  
Seven months after leaving the coast I reached Mumias, a station to the southeast of Mount Elgon, on the northern slopes of which we marched, and found many of the caves among the mountains still inhabited. I spent some time in investigating the habits of these cave-dwellers, a considerable number of whom exist in these prehistoric lava caves. Under the guidance of an old man I visited several of the caves, and found them to contain the houses in which these people live. Both men and women were clothed in skins, and, though exceedingly timid, were quite friendly. After crossing a country which is shown on the maps as a lake, but where there was evidence of its existence, I struck a portion of the route followed by the Macdonald expedition, and presently reached a village where large quantities of stores had been left by that officer in charge of the local chiefs. All had, however, been looted, but at another village where supplies had also been left by that expedition, the natives had refused to take these stores, and fighting was actually in progress, as I was told it had been ever since the stores had been left, and in the defence of two hills, one of four and other of two, which must long since have become decomposed and useless, from marauding natives these tribes had lost hundreds of lives.

THIS PICTURE WILL RECALL OLD DAYS.



St. John Before the Fire of 1877.  
The photo was taken from the roof of a building on Princess street, just above German. The house to the left, in the foreground stood on the site of the present Clifton and those just across Princess street from it were on the site of the present Union Club and Orange Hall. The main view is down Princess street toward the harbor and shows the roof of the city hall. Old-timers will be able to pick out familiar houses all along the street. At the time Canterbury street did not extend below Princess.

Those who remember the St. John of 1877, prior to the great fire, will be especially interested in the picture herewith reproduced from a photo taken by Notman in that year, and kindly placed at the Telegraph's disposal by Chief Kerr.

panopy, awaiting an attack from the Karajojo.

**The Elephant Cemetery.**  
After following the Tarash country to a point near that crossed by Well, I came upon a series of brackish springs, at the foot of a mountain range. The country round was dotted over with several hundred skeletons of elephants. My guides told me that this was known as the place where the elephants came to die, and that the natives regularly came to remove the bones to the dead Swahili traders' stories of elephant cemeteries, but hitherto had always refused to believe them.

When little ones are all the sensible mother no longer does them with narrow, gripping purgatives. She puts them to sleep with the gentle "soothing" preparations which only contain harmful opiates. Baby's own Tablets have been used by thousands of mothers who cheerfully testify that they are gentle in their action, absolutely safe, and make little ones sleep soundly and naturally. They remove the trouble that makes baby irritable and waken. On this point Mrs. Warren, Saratoga, Ont., says: "I have used your Tablets for my own children. When baby is cross or fretful I give her a tablet, and in soon puts her right to sleep."

**Lord Roberts Improving.**  
London, Nov. 15--Lord Roberts, the British commander-in-chief, who is recovering from pneumonia, passed a good night and is making satisfactory progress toward recovery.

THE EXPULSION OF THE ACADIANS.

Rev. Dr. Raymond Treats of a Tragic Chapter in Local History--A Conflict Near Hillsboro--Boishebert Abandons the Fort at St. John and Moves Farther Up River.

W. O. RAYMOND, LL. D.  
CHAPTER XII. (Continued 3.)  
FROM THE TREATY OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE TO THE ACADIAN EXPULSION.

As time went on the Acadians became impatient at the delay in settling the limits of Acadia. In vain they were annually told the boundaries would soon be determined, all negotiation proved fruitless. Those who had crossed the isthmus into what is now the County of Westmorland found themselves undecided as to their future course. Their inclination--a very natural one--seemed to have been to return to the fields they had abandoned, but "Abbe Le Loure" urged them to remain under French rule as the only way of enjoying un molested the privileges of their religion. For their encouragement and protection Fort Beauséjour was erected.

In the month of January, 1754, Lieut.-Governor Lawrence informed the Lords of Trade that the French were hard at work making settlements on the St. John and were offering great inducements to the Acadians of the peninsula to join them. He could not prevent some families from going, but the greater part were much attached to their lands to leave them. In the opinion of Lawrence it was absolutely necessary, for the development and control of Acadia as an English colony, that the forts of Beauséjour and the mouth of the River St. John should be destroyed, and the French driven from the settlements they were establishing north of the Bay of Fundy. Although the Indians had committed no hostilities for two years, he believed no dependence could be placed on their quietude as long as the French were allowed to consult with the Governor of Massachusetts, Sir William Shirley, about the removal of the Acadians from Chignecto and the River St. John. He proposed that two thousand troops should be raised in New England, which with the regular troops already in Nova Scotia would be sufficient for the business, the command of the expedition to be given to Colonel Robert Monckton. It was intended the expedition should sail from Boston about the 20th of April, but it was delayed more than a month awaiting the arrival of arms from England, and it was not until early in June that it arrived at Chignecto. To aid the expedition Captain Rous was sent with a small squadron to the Bay of Fundy. The details of the siege of Fort Beauséjour need not here be given, suffice it to say that after four days' bombardment the Sieur de Verger was obliged, on the 16th June, to surrender to Colonel Monckton.

**The Driving Out of the Acadians.**  
Captain Rous, with three twenty-gun ships and a sloop, immediately sailed for St. John, where it was reported the French had two ships of thirty-six guns each. He anchored outside the harbor and sent his boats to reconnoitre. They found the French ships and on their appearance Boishebert, the officer in command, ordered his fort, burst his cannon, blew up his magazine, burned everything he could, and marched off. The next morning the Indians invited Captain Rous ashore and gave him the strongest assurances of their desire to make peace with the English, saying that they had refused to assist the French.

A few weeks after Boishebert had been thus obliged to abandon Fort Menagouche there occurred the tragic event known as the "Acadian Expulsion." The active agents employed by Lawrence and Shirley in this transaction were Colonel Monckton and his subordinates, of whom Lieut.-Colonel John Winslow and Capt. Murray were the most actively engaged. These officers evidently had little regard for the task imposed on them. Winslow in his proclamation to the inhabitants of Grand Pré, Minas, etc., says: "The duty I am now upon, though necessary, is (Continued on page 6.)"

**Lord Roberts Improving.**  
London, Nov. 15--Lord Roberts, the British commander-in-chief, who is recovering from pneumonia, passed a good night and is making satisfactory progress toward recovery.

WHY JUDGE ALVERSTONE GAVE HIS DECISION AGAINST CANADA.

Text of His Lordship's Finding in the Crucial Questions Which Arose in the Dispute Over the Alaska Boundary.

(From London Times.)  
The following are the answers of Lord Alverstone to the crucial questions--the second and fifth--which the Alaska boundary commissioners had to decide--

**Second Question.**  
What Channel is the Portland Channel? The answer to this question, as indicated by the learned counsel on both sides, depends upon the simple question: What did the contracting parties mean by the words "the channel called the Portland Channel" in Article III of the treaty of 1825? This is a pure question of fact. In order to answer it one must endeavor to put oneself in the position of the contracting parties, and ascertain as accurately as possible what was known to them of the geography of the district as far as relates to the channel called the Portland Channel.

There are certain broad facts which, in my opinion, establish beyond any reasonable doubt that the negotiators had before them Vancouver's maps, the Russian map (No. 5 in the British, No. 6 in the American Atlas), Arrowsmith's map (probably the map numbered 10 in the American Atlas), and Faden's maps (British Appendix, pp. 10 and 11).

I have, moreover, no doubt that the negotiators were acquainted with the information contained in Vancouver's narrative. I do not think it necessary to state in detail the evidence which has led me to this conclusion beyond stating that, quite apart from the overwhelming probability that this was the case, there are the words of the documents which, in my judgment, establish it to demonstration, but for the purpose of my reasons it is sufficient to say that I have come to that clear conclusion after the most careful perusal of the documents.

**The Portland Channel.**  
I will now endeavor to summarize the facts relating to the channel called Portland Channel, which the information afforded by the maps and documents to which I have referred, establish. The first and most important is that it was perfectly well known before, and at the date of the treaty, that there were two channels or inlets, the one called Portland Channel, the other Observatory Inlet, both of them coming out to the westward entrance of Observatory Inlet between Point Maskeyne on the south, and Port Wales on the north.

negotiations, but it is distinctly established that Russia urged that her dominion should extend to 55 degrees latitude, and that it was in the knowledge of both parties that Portland Channel, which issues into the sea at 54 degrees 45 minutes, was conceded and ultimately agreed to by Russia. No claim was made by Russia to any of the islands south of 54 degrees 45 minutes, except Prince of Wales Island, and that the more marked by giving them a selection on the photograph. It was truly a remarkable spectacle, why the people proved friendly to that they were so dumfounded at my arrival in their rear--a direction which was not expected, had ever entered their country. They were at the time in full war

**The Point of the Question.**  
Stated shortly, I understand this question to ask whether the eastern boundary, whether fixed by the crest of the mountains or by distance of 10 marine leagues, was to run round the heads of the bays, ports, inlets, havens, and waters of the ocean, or not. I have come to the conclusion in the affirmative--viz., that the boundary, whether running along the summits or crests of the mountains or in the absence of mountains--a distance of 10 marine leagues, was to run round the heads of the inlets, and not to cross them.

**The Answer.**  
Inasmuch as the question submitted to us only involves the determination of the channel described in the treaty by the words "the channel called the Portland Channel," subsequent history can show no light upon this question; but I think it right to say that the use in the year 1813 of the name Portland Inlet in the British Admiralty Chart, upon which much reliance was placed on behalf of the United States, has, in my opinion, no bearing upon the question, and the reference to Tongue Island in 1837 as being on the frontier of the Russian Straits, and in 1863 as being on the north side of the Portland Canal, and in 1869 as to Tongue being on the boundary between Alaska and British Columbia, are strongly confirmatory of the view at which I have arrived upon the consideration of the materials which were in existence at the date of the treaty.

I therefore answer the second question as follows--  
The channel which runs to the north of Pease and Wales Islands, and issues into the Pacific between Wales Island and Sitkin Island.

(Signed) ALVERSTONE.  
October 29, 1903.

**Fifth Question.**  
In extending the line of demarcation northward from the said point on the parallel of 56th degree of north latitude, following the crest of the mountains situated parallel to the coast until its intersection with the 141st degree of longitude

what it means, and what can be gathered from the language of the treaty alone. The parties were making an agreement, as the opening words of the treaty show, as to the limits of their respective possessions on the north-west coast of the continent, and there cannot be any question that the word "coast" in Articles I, II, and III, refers to the north-west coast of America. The first ambiguity arises upon the word "coast" in Article IV, which does not refer to the north-west coast of America. The first ambiguity arises upon the word "coast" in Article IV, which does not refer to the north-west coast of America. The first ambiguity arises upon the word "coast" in Article IV, which does not refer to the north-west coast of America.

and the line referred to in paragraph 2 of Article IV, was to be measured from those waters. This consideration, however, is not sufficient to solve the question, it still leaves open the interpretation of the word "coast" to which the mountains were to be parallel.

Now, it is to be observed that prima facie the eastern boundary is to be fixed under Article III, as already pointed out, it is not necessary to have recourse to Article IV, unless the mountains which correspond to those described in Article III, prove to be a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the coast, and in that case the boundary is being determined in accordance with Article III.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

and the line referred to in paragraph 2 of Article IV, was to be measured from those waters. This consideration, however, is not sufficient to solve the question, it still leaves open the interpretation of the word "coast" to which the mountains were to be parallel.

Now, it is to be observed that prima facie the eastern boundary is to be fixed under Article III, as already pointed out, it is not necessary to have recourse to Article IV, unless the mountains which correspond to those described in Article III, prove to be a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the coast, and in that case the boundary is being determined in accordance with Article III.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

and the line referred to in paragraph 2 of Article IV, was to be measured from those waters. This consideration, however, is not sufficient to solve the question, it still leaves open the interpretation of the word "coast" to which the mountains were to be parallel.

Now, it is to be observed that prima facie the eastern boundary is to be fixed under Article III, as already pointed out, it is not necessary to have recourse to Article IV, unless the mountains which correspond to those described in Article III, prove to be a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the coast, and in that case the boundary is being determined in accordance with Article III.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

and the line referred to in paragraph 2 of Article IV, was to be measured from those waters. This consideration, however, is not sufficient to solve the question, it still leaves open the interpretation of the word "coast" to which the mountains were to be parallel.

Now, it is to be observed that prima facie the eastern boundary is to be fixed under Article III, as already pointed out, it is not necessary to have recourse to Article IV, unless the mountains which correspond to those described in Article III, prove to be a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the coast, and in that case the boundary is being determined in accordance with Article III.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.

Turning now from the consideration of the language of the treaty alone, what light is thrown upon this question by reference to the negotiations? I have been unable to find any passage which supports the view that Great Britain was directly or indirectly putting forward a claim to the shores or ports at the head of the inlets. This is not remarkable inasmuch as no one at the time had any idea that they would become of any importance.