

ing, they required agricultural implements and cattle. They were, generally speaking, very attentive to the instructions of their clergymen, and even as hunters, they carried their religious books with them, and he believed on the Sabbath abstained from hunting. There were some native ordained ministers and some catechists, upon whom he had devolved a little power, and they went among the Indians teaching them to read and write what is called the syllabic characters. The children of the Indians are learning English; and he considered it an important element in the improvement of any native race, that they should learn the language of the civilised people who come among them, even if it was to exist concurrently with their own. The soil was more productive than that of the United States, or Canada; he saw no obstacles to successful colonization; and that when once cultivation is commenced, it might extend from the Red River, westwards. His lordship further stated that commerce can be carried on to any extent at the Red River, and that, indeed, there was a strong body of traders there. The Bishop further intimated that grants of agricultural implements from philanthropic bodies in this country would be very useful to the Indians, and would greatly promote the work of civilisation among them.

The deputation, having thanked the Bishop for his courtesy, then withdrew.

News Department.

Extracts from English Papers by the Niagara.

RUSSIA.

It appears that a document was addressed by the Russian Government at the latter end of October to all the Powers that signed the Treaty of Paris, accompanied by a request for the reconvoation of the Paris Conference. This memorandum is an *expose* of the steps taken by the Cabinet of St. Petersburg with a view to the fulfilment of the Articles 20 and 21 of the Treaty of the 30th of March. As regards the Isle of Serpents, the Russian Government says—

"It will suffice to read carefully the text of the stipulations to be convinced that they refer to a demarcation on the main land, and do not apply to the possession of an island situate in the open sea. In fact, no express stipulation of the treaty has either annexed to Moldavia or adjudged to Turkey that island, which was incontestibly in the possession of Russia before the rupture."

As regards the Bessarabian frontier question, the memorandum says—

"Whenever the delegates for the settlement of the frontier line came upon a local difficulty which they could not settle on their own responsibility, an immediate decision, sent by an order of the Czar, razed their doubts and rendered their work easy in a perfect spirit of conciliation. In support of this truth it will suffice to mention two facts.

"According to Art. 20 the new frontier, starting at one kilometre from the lake of Borna-Sola, was to rejoin perpendicularly the Akermann road. That line cut in two Lake Hadji-Abraham, and left Lake Basiriam entirely to Russia. The inspection of the localities showed the defect of such delimitation.

"The Imperial Cabinet allowed its delegates to remedy this inconvenience, so as to include the two lakes in the Moldavian territory.

"Again, the 20th Art. made the frontier end at Katamori, on the Pruth. The text of the treaty did not express whether that place was to belong to Russia or to be given to Moldavia. The Imperial Cabinet obviated that difficulty by allowing Katamori to be joined to the Principality."

As regards the course of the Upper Yalpuck and the town of Bolgrad, the memorandum says—

"As regards the first point, the text of the treaty indicated the river Yalpuck as the frontier line. In its course, at a place called Andreeska, the river splits into two arms, one bearing the name of Yalpuck, the other that of Yalpuckhel. The letter of the treaty implies the former; the other arm would give a more enlarged frontier to Moldavia. The delegates have reserved this question for the solution of the Cabinets.

"As regards the second point in dispute, that of the town of Bolgrad, a consideration of good faith seems to determine this question. It is this. When the Congress came to discuss and to decree in principle the new frontier line, the Russians frankly declared the importance of not taking away the town of Bolgrad from the Bulgarian colonies, of which it is the capital. This administrative consideration, so frankly expressed, received the unanimous votes of all the representatives, given in a spirit of concord and conciliation. Consequently it was resolved, by

common accord, that the frontier line should pass south of Bolgrad, as is clearly and precisely stated in the text of Art. 20. This resolution was not taken on the inspection of maps produced at the Conference by the Plenipotentiaries of Russia. Printed in Russian, they might not have appeared sufficiently intelligible to all the representatives of the Congress. They, therefore, formed their conclusions from the examination of a map placed at their disposal by the care of the French Government.

This fact is worthy of mention. It shows that if the maps were faulty, the responsibility does not rest with the Russian Plenipotentiaries. Moreover, their frank speech had set aside any misunderstanding. They had declared that the town of Bolgrad, which it was important should be preserved to Russia, was the capital of the Bulgarian colonies.

"In this avowal there was neither concealment, misunderstanding, nor deceit. The Congress, in adhering to the desire expressed by the Russian Plenipotentiaries, performed an act of equity and wisdom. In fact, its decision upon the question of Bolgrad brought the discussion to a close. Art. 20 was drawn up conformably to the resolution taken at the sitting of the 10th of March. The Russian Plenipotentiaries thought right, however, to make a reserve of the approbation of their Court. That approbation was announced by Count Orloff in the sitting of 14th March, Prot. IX.

"In this grave deliberation it may be said the unanimity of opinion (accord) of the Plenipotentiaries at the Conference was complete. Doubtless the Cabinets by ratifying the acts of their Plenipotentiaries, had not the intention of questioning or disavowing the spirit of equity and harmony which presided over their labours.

"The first motive of dissent arose when the delegates had visited the localities; they then found that the town of Bolgrad, instead of being situate at some distance from Lake Yalpuck, as was indicated upon all the maps, touched the northern extremity of the lake.

"The position thus ascertained on the spot gave rise to a difference of opinion between the respective delegates as regarded the crossing of the frontier line intrusted to their care.

"The Russian delegates proposed to take as demarcation limit the valley line (*Thalweg*), leaving the left shore of the lake to Russia, the right shore to Moldavia.

"This combination was deemed inadmissible by the other commissioners. In their opinion, access to the lake open on the left bank to Russia might engender the fear of the Imperial Government forming a flotilla upon the lake, the presence of which might some day be an impediment to the free navigation of the Danube.

"This opposition we may be allowed to say, did not tally in reality with the nature of the locality. Moreover if the project of the Russian commissioners had been admitted all subject of anxiety would have been removed beforehand by the express condition that a single *brandwacht* (boat) should be allowed for the use of the Russian authorities, to be kept at a fixed station, for the use of the custom and sanitary officers. Such a condition would surely have excluded the slightest anxiety respecting the free navigation of the Danube.

"Nevertheless, the proposal of the Russian delegates met with decided opposition. The French Commissioner, with a view to conciliate conflicting opinions, suggested a new plan—to make a high road (*chaussée*) along the shore of the lake, and thus to separate the town of Bolgrad from the shores of Lake Yalpuck, with the exception of permission to the inhabitants to have access to the borders of the lake for their daily wants.

"By this combination the whole lake would remain Moldavian, while the town of Bolgrad, the capital of the colonies, would remain in the possession of Russia.

"The Imperial Cabinet of Russia did not hesitate to give its consent to this proposal, which conciliated all interests and all mutual considerations. The Austrian, English, and Turkish delegates were not authorised to adopt this compromise. In their opinion, the frontier line instead of passing south of Bolgrad, the capital, as understood by the Congress, and as stated in Article 20 of the treaty, ought to be drawn south of the place named Tabak. A much to be regretted controversy has arisen on this point.

"A few words will serve to elucidate the question by placing it in its true light. The place called Tabak is not the central point of the administration of the Bulgarian colonies. For many years the town of Bolgrad has been the capital. Church, school, government, population, are all concentrated in Bolgrad. Ta-

bak, as all the delegates were able to ascertain, does not, therefore, in any manner respond to the intention avowed openly, in which the Russian plenipotentiaries asked, and which the other Plenipotentiaries united at the Congress granted, that Bolgrad should remain in the possession of Russia.

"This is a simple question of good faith. If the line should be drawn south of Tabak it would be contrary to the spirit and the letter of the text. Bolgrad would be separated from the colonies, while it was agreed that town should remain annexed to them. In a word, the Treaty of the 25th of March would not be carried out conformably to the idea which presided over that transaction.

"In this state of affairs the Emperor is of the opinion that the most honorable thing to be done is to appeal to the consciences of the Cabinets that signed the Treaty of Paris.

"Consequently, by order of his Majesty, the Russian Envoy on a mission extraordinary to his Majesty the Emperor of the French had the honor of addressing to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, under date of September 19, an official note, reiterating a request for the convocation of a conference, consisting of the representatives of all the contracting powers.

"Agreeing to this request, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the name of his Government, has invited the other Cabinets to decide by common accord all the points which have hitherto remained in suspense.

"So as to give to this diplomatic meeting the character and the merit of the final solution of all the questions in dispute, Count Walewski asked Baron Brunow whether the Court of Russia, participating in this deliberation, was decided by a majority of votes.

"To this question, transmitted by telegraph to St. Petersburg, the Imperial Cabinet sent back an immediate reply in the affirmative."

The memorandum concludes by expressing the hope that these two points of minor importance of detail will be satisfactorily settled. In conclusion, Russia calls attention to the continued occupation of the Principalities by Austria as objectionable, and especially appeals to France to secure the neutralisation of the Black Sea.

INDIA.

The last mail brings the Proclamation of War against Persia, made at Calcutta on the 1st of November, in which the Governor General sets forth his reasons for the expedition which has left Bombay. From this it appears that it was stipulated by treaty in 1853—

"That so long as there should be no interference of any sort whatever on the part of the British Government in the affairs of Herat, certain engagements contracted by the Persian Government should remain in full force and effect. On the other hand it was agreed, in the name of the British Government, that if any foreign Power, such as the Afghans or others, should wish to interfere with, or take possession of Herat, the British Government, on the requisition of the Persian Ministers, would not object to restrain such foreign power by friendly advice, so that Herat might remain in its own state of independence."

"While the British Government has faithfully and constantly adhered to the obligations which it accepted under the agreement of January, 1853, the Government of Persia has manifested a deliberate and persevering disregard of the reciprocal engagements, by which at the same time, it became bound and is now endeavoring to subvert by force the independence of Herat, which was the declared object of the agreement in question."

Various acts by the Persian Government in contravention of the treaty are then set forth, concluding with the siege of Herat, which has been carried on some months:

"The conduct of the Persian Government has been pronounced by her Majesty's Government to constitute an act of open hostility against Great Britain. Reparation has been sought, but without success. The withdrawal of the Persian troops from the neighborhood of Herat to Persian soil has been demanded, a preliminary to the adjustment of the differences to which the acts of Persia alone have given rise; but the demand has been evaded, and, according to the most recent accounts, a Persian army still invests Herat.

"Friendly remonstrance having failed, and a reasonable requisition having been rejected or put aside, it becomes incumbent on the British Government to take measures by which the Persian government shall be convinced that solemn engagements contracted with Great Britain may not be violated with impunity, and by which effectual guarantees against continuous breach of faith shall be secured."