Notes on a Report by Mr Klotz on "Alaska", dated December 1887.

Speaking generally of Mr Klotz' account of the physical features of the Coast of the part of Alaska stretching [illegible], I may say that in essential points it agrees with my own conception of the character of the Coast as embodied in a short report prepared for Sir C. Tupper in the winter of 1887-88. X This report was entitled "Notes on the physical features of part of the West Coast of North America in their relation to the position of the Boundary Line between Alaska & Canada."

I would add, however, that though I have crossed the Alaska "Coast Strip" in two places & skirted part of its shore in canoe most of my general observations were made (as in Mr Klotz' case) from the deck of the mail steamer.

There certain important facts of a general character still remain to be ascertained, & this might easily & at little cost be done by examining certain parts of the Coast by means of a Canoe or boat & visiting some islands & sounds of limited extent. The main point to be ascertained is the existence or otherwise of passes through the Coast Ranges to the interior in addition to those already known. Where a river reported to be nearly equal to the Yukon in size is said to flow into Port

X This report was prepared for the late Hon T. White & copy sent – was afterwards (Nov. 25. 1887) sent by Sir Charles Tupper, together with other special information collected for by him

Snettisham, & [illegible]
bellays of some importance probably
occur at the heads of Bradfield Canal,
Burroughs Bay & other similar bays or
inlets.
A knowledge of the character of such
alternative passes to the interior, if they
exist, has no doubt by this time been
obtained by the U.S. Government. Canada
should obviously be independently in
possession of the same information in
order that any discussions relating to
boundary may be undertaken on equal
terms.

(N.B. See the following memoranda
& remarks on the report by Mr Holt,
the references made are to the pages
& paragraphs in the typewritten copy)

p. 14 ¶ 5 – 6. These paragraphs appear
to give the idea that S.E. Alaska (= the
Alaska "Coast-strip") has some considerable
width. My view is that S.E. Alaska has
practically no "interior". The Stikine
flows a few miles across S.E. Alaska
to reach the sea. It is further to be
maintained that the lower courses of
the Taku & Chilkat, including the
heads of the inlets into which they flow,
are Canadian.

pp. 18 et seq. The Boundary Line.
The greater part of this discussion of the meaning of the Convention of 1825, is based on documents & maps which have been brought together & fully treated of by Major-General Cameron in his report: Mr Klotz establishes the ground already covered by General Cameron, but does not on all points agree with his conclusions.

I would respectfully suggest that Mr Klotz might state in succinct form, on what special points he finds reason to disagree with General Cameron's contention, in order that such points may be privately discussed & that if possible a concurrence of opinion should be arrived at concerning them.

The inclusion in this discussion by Mr Klotz of references to certain papers obtained by General Cameron from the Foreign Office & embraced by him in the report previously referred to, naturally renders Mr Klotz' report of an equally confidential character. It has been considered advisable to hold the diplomatic correspondence which led up to the Convention of 1825 in reserve for the present.

pp. 20-21 The contention advanced by the Government of British Columbia respecting the Southern part of the Boundary Line is adversely criticised. As the Provincial Government has officially asked the Dominion Government to

Recentering this contention, & as some appears of it may be understood as an 'interest' of nothing more, I would suggest that its criticism may be left to the United States authorities.

p. 28 l 6, & p. 27 (wrongly last l). Embodies a ~~[illegible]~~ discussion of the confusion of nomenclature of which has occurred in the U.S. Coast Pilot;

p. 28 l 2 & p. 31 l 3. On the point of the line between the head of Portland Canal & the point at which it reaches the 56th parallel. I believe the view advocated by Mayne-Reeve Cameron on this subject to be the correct one.

p. 30. last l. Everyone would I believe hold that an elevation of 1000 feet would constitute a mountain for purposes of definition.

p. 31 l 38. These citations from the U.S. Coast Pilot, Alaska, are useful for reference. I think, however, that we should not be justified in accepting the dictum of the Coast Pilot as to what are & what are not mountains along the Alaska Coast. For the purposes of the Treaty this it is evident that we should contend for the crest of the first range behind the Coast whether this is called 'mountain' or not in the Coast Pilot. Further, the discussion of the mountains bordering Taku Inlet,

Lynn Canal etc. may give the impression that we are looking for a line Edward thus idle & that we do not claim their island possessions as Canadian.

p. 3 last P. This statement as here broadly made does not correspond with the facts. Much of Alaska is a low, level country, with only scattered ranges of outlying mountains. Nothing whatever corresponds of the country on the north side of the St Elias range between Chitkat River (Kroomen) & Copper River (Allen).

p. 41 P 5. I doubt the wisdom of characterizing the alternative boundary as "long & tedious impracticable". We are not called upon to do so. The United States contention appears to be that both the alternative boundaries are impracticable & in thus characterizing one of them we yield half the case.

p. 42 P 5. We should never admit in terms that we have to follow an "irregular & labyrinthine coast line". ~~This~~ ~~admission~~ is destructive of General Cameron's view respecting the possibilities of a mountain boundary to the ocean coast line; a view which it is most important to maintain if it still possible to do so.

p. 48 but P. Petroff's suggested Boundary has never been backed up by any authority or seriously advanced by anyone but himself

p. 48 & p. 50 & p. 51. The observations of [illegible] on this subject deserve careful consideration. It may be said, however, (1) that a literal translation of Russian words, as a geographic line, would require to be fixed; (2) that great difficulty may be anticipated in determining authority which natural features are to be taken as forming the boundary. While it is to be hoped that amicable & equitable views will govern both decisions, the superior power in power was shown that this can not be counted on. As an instance I need only allude to the attitude of the Ch. Govt. in respect to the fixing of the N.W. angle of the Lake of the Woods.

p. 44 & p. 45 & p. 52. This contention appears to be well based. I would remark, however, that the British Columbian Government explains the provision that Prince of Wales Island shall belong wholly to Russia, as implying that the line should go northward up Clarence Strait parallel to the island.

p. 45 & 53. "E.E. Alaska" has practically no "interior" we maintain that it is a narrow belt along the coast.

p. 65 l. 8. to one not proposed to allow
as is here done, that the United States
has any title to the shores of Lynn Canal.

p. 67 l. 3 & p. 69 l. 12. Mr. Bell's treatment
of the question of the boundary line in
the Lynn Canal appears to me to display a
complete & wilful misunderstanding.

p. 69 l. 3 & note of p. 70. Had of this opinion,
& not pertinent to Alaska & pure conject.
Mr. Bell's statements respecting the boundary
below are off 40-50 ch. are very loose &
misleading. I think, however, that inasm.
should not be taken with Mr. Bell as the
grounds of unofficial information of Sir L. Alexander,
as the bases his official opinion & are
opposite extract. In addition to such
loose expressions as Mr. Bell may possess,
he actually compiles the volume
entitled Pacific Coast Pilot, Alaska Part 1.
(op. cit. p. 11) from which Mr. Klotz
in previous papers, has quoted largely.
Also, p. 52 l. 12. If the coast trip runs
parallel to the general direction of the
main coast as has been contended,
it cannot be restricted as "running
in many directions."
p. 52 l. 4. as before stated, I believe
the case not safely in advance consid-
ering any official pronouncement or consideration
in regard to points left to be decided by
commissioners on the ground, neither of
them would probably feel it to be
within his province to yield anything
which he could fairly maintain.

p. 89 & end of Report. In the general view, as has formerly been stated of the Bill, as to the necessary preliminaries & general heads of contending the Remedy sought, I fully concur.

As to the Convention of 1818 meant in the point for the interpretation & satisfaction of both parties, & a dispute has for such long before every parties are sent out for the purpose of obtaining. Differences against in my Expressions with the Bill show that the intended parties cannot be expected to reach full agreement on this subject. Certain contending points would therefore require either to be compromised, or decided by some mode of arbitration, the arguments on both sides being fully presented.

Such previous agreement is necessary, there can arise to the strict [illegible] & adopt some family [illegible] Convenient Conventional lies. — In the latter case in order to enable an equitable selection of critical points to be made.

Such preliminary interpretation of the Convention & determination of lies the Bill, might I believe be taken upon at once without discussion, & would be an important step toward a complete settlement. If not settled at once, we must in the defence continue to learn more in detail the features of the country. Such knowledge may not directly facilitate an agreement, but will be necessary in order to enable us to maintain our claims as against the advantage of best knowledge being accumulated

9

by the United States Surveys

George M. Dawson

3 Feb. 1895

L.C. (Copy) 199891.

MEMORANDUM.

British Alaskan Boundary.

On the 17th December, 1888- the Colonial Office transmitted to H.E. the Governor General - a proposal made by the United States Government through Mr. Phelps- on the 6th Dec. '88- that H.M. Government should send a party "to join" and "participate" with a United States party (about to be sent out to Alaska) "in the ex-"amination and survey in such a manner as to reach, if possible, a "joint and concurrent conclusion in respect to the facts material "to be determined"

Mr. Phelps further said that the United States party was to be sent out "for the survey of the locality of the line in "question, and the ascertainment of the facts and data necessary to "its delinitation in accordance with the spirit of the existing "treaties in regard to it- between Great Britain and Russia, and "between the United States and Russia."

It is understood that no decision has yet been arrived at by the Dominion Government with regard to the foregoing proposals, and that the Hon. the Minister of the Interior desires the undersigned to submit a memorandum on the subject for his ~~consider~~ consideration. In the following remarks they propose to indicate what the intention of the United States proposal probably is- in how far it may be desirable for the Dominion Government to assent to the proposal,- and what consequent steps should be taken. In Mr. Phelps' despatch of 6th December, 1888 to Lord Salisbury inviting the British Government to cooperate in their intended survey

is enclosed a letter from the Superintendent of the U.S. Coast and Goedetic Survey which Mr. Phelps remarks shews "the time "and manner of the proposed survey, the composition of the party "and

"and other particulars. These details are of course open to
" modification as may be found advisable by agreement between the
" two Governments should the expedition be prosecuted jointly.

In the letter of the Superintendent of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic survey referred to by Mr. Phelps- the Superintendent says. " Except as to a portion of the frontier line which is coincident
" with the meridian line of the 141st. degree west longitude,
" it would be impossible for a survey to definitely and authorita-
" tively locate the boundary or frontier line. From some infor-
" mal discussion of the matter, it is understood that the Hon.
"Secretary of State will be likely to require that the preliminary
" survey shall, among other things accurately establish in lati-
" tude and longitude and permanently mark, such a number of ac-
" cessible points at certain distances from the coast or along
" certain mountain summits as together with such topographical
"reconnaissance as may be practicable, will afford the geograph-
"ical information requisite to the proper negotiation of a treaty
"establishing the boundary. To obviate during such negotiation all
"controversy as to the accuracy of such geographical information,
"it would seem desirable that both parties should be represented
"in the operations of the preliminary survey by competent surveyors
"and astronomers whose concurrence in the determination of points
"in latitude and longitude and in the delineation of topographical
"feature, would ensure acceptance of their work by the negotia-
"tors and avert one possible occasion of controversy and delay in
"the conclusion of a boundary treaty." On the 14th Dec. 1888
the Superintendent of the U.S. Coast and Geodetical Survey addressed a letter to the Hon. the Minister of the Interior Canada, with a view to facilitating arrangements for cooperation between the two Governments, and in this letter repeated the quotation above given from the enclosure in Mr. Phelps despatch of the 6 Dec. 1888

to

to Lord Salisbury;- but it is noticeable that where in the quotation from the enclosure in Mr. Phelps letter the Superintendent writes. "it would be impossible for a survey to definitely "and authoritatively locate the boundary or frontier line"- in his letter to the Hon. the Minister of the Interior he writes of locating "a boundary". Again, in his first letter transmitted through Mr. Phelps he alludes to topographical features "requisite to the proper negotiation of a treaty establishing the boundary". But in his letter to the Minister of the Interior he says "re-"quisite to the proper negotiation of a treaty establishing a bound "ary" and in both letters he writes of the necessity for avoiding delay "in the conclusion of a boundary treaty."

Throughout correspondence with the United States Government for several years past, it has been contended by them that the line prescribed by the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1825 is impracticable. From the foregoing , the undersigned conclude that the United States expedition is to be despatched with a view to procuring data for the conclusion of a new boundary treaty, between the United States & Great Britain, to be substituted for that of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia. Canada, however, cannot prudently assent to the assumption that the line prescribed by the Convention of 1825 is impracticable. There is no evidence of its being impracticable. To carry out surveys on such an assumption requires that the cooperators shall have the limits of their work clearly defined before they enter upon it. Otherwise the work will either be of enormous proportions or cooperations-from absence of preliminary agreement- will be impossible.

From the claims already foreshadowed by the United States in Lynn Canal, the Stikine River, and Portland Canal -and the assumption that the line of the 1825 Convention is impracticable the United States surveys will inevitably be pushed if possible up to the limits of the ten marine leagues line measured from the Coast

Coast and head of inlets.

"La Crête des montagnes situées parallelement a la cote"- in the treaty will be interpreted by them as having reference to the main watershed of the whole region- which watershed is known, from the course of the Stikine and other rivers, to be generally beyond the ten marine league area. They will contend for this interpretation because if they admit that "La Crête" applies to Mountains other than those of the Main divide they cannot consistently admit the reference to be applicable to any other Crête' than that of the mountains nearest the Ocean- which in effect would be conceding all for which Canada can contend as regards the Coast strip.

From this point of view it would be hopeless to expect that parties sent out by Canada and the United States could co-operate- for the United States party would explore for either an extreme limit or for a conventional line, while the attention of the Canadian parties would be directed towards locating the line prescribed by the Convention of 1825.

In order that the great and manifest advantages of co-operation may accrue, it is essential that the parties shall be agreed in the object they have in view.

As regards the meridian of 141° W. Longitude there can be no divergence of opinion as to the common object in view and co-operation in determining this meridian to any required extent may and we think should be, readily assented to.

In respect of the portion of the line between the Southermost point of the Prince of Wales Island and the head of Portland Canal the United States have advanced views which are opposed to those maintained by Great Britain- but the difference is of a kind that does not touch the question of surveys. Whichever view prevails the authoritative determination of the Southermost

point

point of the Prince of Wales Island- and the accurate location of any islands between Prince of Wales Island & the continent on the line to the Ocean entrance to Portland Canal will be necessary and cooperation in this should be readily assented to.

Again, the ascertainment of standard points of longitude along the coast Northward to 141° W. Longitude is a matter of equal interest and importance to Canada and the United States- as a base on which to found future inland surveys. Consequently co-operation in this work is strongly recommended. There remains the portions of the line through Portland Canal and thence to the Meridian of 141° W. Longitude.

The United States contend that Portland Inlet is a part of the Portland Canal through which the Convention of 1825 directs the line to be run. Canada denies this, and maintains that the passage along the coast through Pearse Channel to the Ocean is part of Portland Canal. The divergence of opinion here is one that need not stand in the way of co-operation it being understood that the British party's attention will be specially directed to the survey of the passage from the South of Tongas Island along the main coast through Pearse channel into waters which are admitted on both sides to form part of Portland Canal. The British Admiralty Survey of Portland Canal made in 1868- will probably suffice for all purposes for the part of the line between Pearse Canal and the head of the Portland Canal. In the meantime it is desirable that the Governments concerned should without delay come to an agreement on th following points which cannot possibly be elucidated by any surveys to be made-(a) Does the convention of 1825 require that the direction of the delimiting line between Russian & British Territory shall be the most direct between the Southermost point of the Prince of Wales Island and the Ocean entrance to Portland Chanel? or, is it required that this line should anywhere follow a parallel of latitude?(b) Is the United States or is the Canadian contention

as

as to the interpretation of the name Portland Channel occurring in the Convention of 1825- the correct one. These questions being determined the only remaining hinderance to the full acceptance of the United States invitation to co-operate with them is to be found in their absence of assent to the contention that the words "la crete des Montaignes situées parallelment à la côte" occurring in the 3rd Article of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1825 refer to the Mountains nearest to the ocean and not to any others occurring further inland.

It is suggested that at the earliest practicable date the United States should be invited to intimate with precision how they interpret these words; and that failing their arrival at agreement with the Canadian contention they may be invited to submit the question to arbitration.

If they assent to the Canadian contention their invitation to co-operate with them along the coast strip should be readily accepted; but if they prefer a reference to arbitration the acceptance with regard to this part of the line should be postponed until arbitration has taken place- and in the meantime the British parties may advantageously pursue their surveys in accordance with British contentions- independently.

On 19th April, 1886, Sir Lionel West communicated a Memorandum to Mr. Bayard stating that the Dominion Government had expressed its general agreement to a preliminary survey such as was suggested in the Presidents message, and was of opinion that such a survey would enable the two Governments to establish a satisfactory basis for the delimitation of the frontier and would demonstrate whether the conditions of the convention of 1825 were applicable to the now more or less known features of the country.

The assent of the Dominion Government thus expressed may not be construed as an assent to a proposal to proceed with a survey with the assumption that the line prescribed by the Convention

of

of 1825 is impracticable. On the contrary the statement maintains the contention that the survey should be directed towards giving effect to the terms of the Convention of 1825.

It is submitted that the following steps have now to be taken.

H.M. Government have to be informed of the decision arrived at by the Dominion Government- in reply to the Colonial Office despatch of the 17th December 1888- communicating the United States proposal to H.E. the Governor General. Assuming that the Dominion Government agree to co-operate with the United States a qualified gentleman should be despatched as soon as possible to Washington to confer with the Superintendent of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey and to obtain detailed information as to the organization of the United States Expedition. It would be desirable that the gentleman sent on this misson should be the one to whom is to be entrusted the organization and superintendence of the Canadian parties. He should be fully informed of the views of the Dominion Government as regards the extent to which the work is to be done in co-operation with the United States parties and independently. He should be directed to collect all available required instruments, be empowered to have such of them as need readjustment or repair put in order, and to have prepared a list of additional ones that may be needed; he should communicate with those from whom it is proposed to procure the additional instruments to ensure their being ready if and when needed. At the very earliest date at which he can do so- he should give details of the parties he will require. The leaders of ~~these~~ these parties should be selected without delay and as soon as it is decided to prosecute the surveys they should be appointed and their services placed at the disposal of the gentleman who is to have chief control- and he should complete his plans for transport, food, clothing, shelter and storage

for

for the five months during which field work can be carried on, and for the remainder of the year- and for the continuation of work for the second and third years- and for the hire and ~~and~~ discharge of local labour. It is understood that the Canadian Government has not got a sufficient supply of chronometers at its disposal. It is suggested that these may be borrowed from H.M. Government on condition that they be returned in good order. The Navy on the Pacific Coast would probably be able to undertake the hydrographic survey between the Prince of Wales Island and the head of Portland Canal- and might also determine the standard longitude points, probably four in number, on the shores of the Coast strip, the Navy might also undertake all necessary water transport for the surveying parties. This assistance would be a source of efficiency and economy. The rest of the work it is suggested may probably be thoroughly and most economically effected by Canadian parties.

If these suggestions with reference to Naval assistance are approved- it would be necessary to cable to H.M. Government intimating that the Canadian Government propose to co-operate with the United States Government in the survey and asking for the assistance of the Navy as indicated above and for the loan of chronometers. The United States propose, it is understood, to put one party on the Meridian of 141° W. Longitude by means of a special steamer ascending the Yukon- and they offer to take a British astronomer and Surveyor with them: They would probably agree to carry two or three assistants, and this would suffice for the region referred to.

On the coast strip it is believed the United States intend putting four combined astronomical and surveying parties; and to move to the field of operations in April. It is consequently manifest that arrangements must be commenced without any delay if the Canadian parties are to co-operate with those of the United States.

It

It will tend to facilitate arrangements if H.M. Government assents to all details including communication with Washington- being carried out under the directions of the Dominion Government. Some special arrangement in respect of the assistance of H.M. Navy would be necessary in order to avoid clashing of authority.

The United States Government should be invited to agree with the Dominion Government as to the interpretation of the words "la crête des montagnes situées parallelment a la côte" and as to the water intended to be designated by the name "Portland Channel" occurring in the 3rd Article of the Anglo Russian Convention of 1825.

In case of a failure to come to an agreement on these points- the survey on the Coast strip as already explained, should be proceeded with by the British party working there independently of the United States party. As regards the Portland Channel-already being surveyed by the United States- the divergence of view should not interfere with surveys there. It is very desirable that this portion should be completed without delay.

(Signed. George M. Dawson.

(Sgd) D.R. Cameron.

Ottawa, 12th Feb., 1889.

P.S. Cost of the Survey.

It is impossible at present to make an estimate of the cost of the survey . The amount of work to be done- and the organization of the parties to be employed not yet being settled, there is no good foundation for an estimate.

Feby 1889.

Memo.

Dawson Cameron

Alaska Boundary

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

(8)

188

In the present position of the Alaskan boundary matter it would appear necessary to decide - (1) ~~whether any~~ what number should be given to the proposed by U.S. joint ~~joint~~ concurrent surveys. (2) To ~~what extent~~ determine some line of policy or claim connected with the boundary which may be ~~taken~~ made the basis of any further action, pending its delimitation. — " —

The following suggestions are offered in connection with the matter. —

1. In replying to the invitation of the U.S. for joint surveys or cooperation in surveying the following courses appear to offer.

a. To accept the proposition & join in the surveys with parties similar in number & equipment to those of the U.S., after ~~assuring~~ being assured at ~~of~~ a definite understanding that the work is undertaken for the purpose of acquiring information only ~~of~~ without prejudice to the claims on either side, & that ~~no~~ official or quasi-official ~~recognition~~ determination of a boundary ~~shall occur~~ ~~the~~ values with the sanction of both parties.

Such surveys shall not be made the basis for the establishment of any

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____188____

B. To refuse to participate in Government of present surveys. This might be done on the ground that ~~that~~ Mr Ogilvie has already established a provisional boundary in the Yukon valley (with regard to which part of his the language of the Convention is clear) & that till such time as the principles of interpretation of the last of the Convention with respect to the "Coast Strip" shall be ~~can~~ mutually agreed upon, the utility of joint surveys in that region is questionable, particularly as the ~~Govt~~ Gov. opinion is opposed as to how far the above action would be warranted by the ~~action already~~ correspondence which has already occurred between the governments interested

ground that the interpretation of the Convention must be arrived at by the joint opinion or the opinion available at time of the conclusion of the

C. To agree to conference in surveys of boundary on 141st Meridian, which of satisfactory can subsequently be hypothecated, but to decline ~~refuse~~ to concrete in surveys of Coast strip region on the grounds above stated. This would not prevent the prosecution of independent surveys carried on ~~for the present~~ with such informal cooperation as surveyors from Canada & the U.S. may be

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____188____

able to arrange on the ground. The U.S. being determined on surveys in the region, it seems necessary to keep pace with ~~the~~ regard & information on the County which may materially be useful in deciding on a continental boundary should such be desired. I am, however, personally ~~strongly~~ of the opinion that in the case of a continental line, the information now in hand is sufficient & that the larger the scale is adopted the more difficult the fixing of the line (whether continental or treaty) will be.

2. Whether Canada or others shall be determined as it appears desirable to reply at once to the proposition of the U.S. ~~[illegible]~~ as their arrangements ~~[illegible]~~ for parties shortly to be despatched depend largely on our action.

3. If surveys of any kind are to be undertaken it is essential that preparations should be begun at once.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____ 188____

4. Respecting the general action of the US., viewed in connection with the former unwillingness of that Country to ~~take an~~ undertake the boundary delimitation. It appears possible that the US authorities having now ascertained that a proper interpretation of the language of the Convention of 1825 is likely to considerably restrict the width of the "Great Strip" may now determine on pushing surveys as a means either of passing over the question of interpretation or of postponing ~~[illegible]~~ its consideration. It appears desirable to keep this possible course distinctly in view, & further to note that by formulating & taking some action on our behalf of the boundary we have the means of forcing the ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ matter of the interpretation of the language of the ~~Convention~~ treaty & a settlement ~~at any time~~ (by Convention or otherwise) ~~[illegible]~~ at consideration at any time. Further that ~~[illegible]~~ events of the nature of those which formerly occurred on the Stikine may occur at any moment, & have the same ~~[illegible]~~ result.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

188

5. It would seem that we are now likely to secure ~~a satisfactory basis for the settlement~~ the determination of the boundary between Canada by a preliminary adjudication & decision on the boundary yet Commission than in any other way. It is worthy of consideration whether any great advance in surveys of 'Great Strip' region may not rather

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

(1

11 February 1889

Memorandum.

In the present position of the Alaskan boundary matter, it would appear to be necessary to decide. — (1.) What answer should be given to the proposal by the U.S., for concurrent surveys. (2.) What line of policy or claim should be made the basis of further action pending the settlement of the boundary.

In connection with these matters the following suggestions are offered

I. In replying to the U.S., on their proposition for joint surveys or cooperation in surveying, the following courses appear to be open. —

a. To accept the proposition & join in the surveys with parties comparable in number & in equipment to those of the U.S.; having first arrived at a definite understanding that the work is undertaken for the purpose of acquiring information only, without prejudice to any claims on either side & that such surveys shall not be made the basis for the establishment of any official or quasi-official determination of a boundary unless with the consent of both parties.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

188

b. To refuse to participate in concurrent surveys at the present time. This might be done on the ground that Mr Ogilvie has already established a provisional boundary in the Yukon valley (with regard to which part of the line the language of the Convention is clear) & that till such time as the principles of interpretation of the text of the Convention with respect to the 'Coast strip' shall have been mutually agreed upon, the utility of joint surveys in that region is questionable, particularly on the ground that the interpretation of the text must be arrived at with reference to the geographical information available at the time of the Convention only.

No opinion is offered as to how far the above action would be consistent with the opinions expressed in the correspondence which has already occurred between the governments interested.

c. To agree to coöperation in surveys of the part of the boundary which is formed by the 141st meridian, which surveys, if satisfactory, may subsequently be given binding force as

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

188

boundary surveys, but to decline to coöperate in surveys of the 'Coast strip' region, on the grounds stated under 1. This would not prevent the prosecution of independent surveys, carried on with such informal coöperation as the surveyors from Canada & the U.S., may find convenient to arrange between themselves in the field.

The U.S. having determined on surveys in the 'Coast strip' region, it seems absolutely necessary to keep pace with ~~them~~ the U.S. in regard to information on the country which may eventually be called for in determining a conventional boundary, should such be decided on. I am, however, personally of the opinion that as regards a conventional line the facts now in hand are sufficient for decision & that the longer the matter is delayed the more difficult the fixing of the line will be — whether a conventional or a treaty line.

2. Whatever course of action may be determined on it appears desirable to reply at once to the proposal of the U.S., as the arrangement of

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

188

the surveys shall be carried out by them depend largely on our action.

3. If surveys of any kind are to be undertaken by us it is essential that preparations should be begun at once.

4. Respecting the present action of the U.S., viewed in connection with the previous unwillingness of that country to undertake the boundary delimitation.— It appears possible that the U.S. authorities having now ascertained that a reasonable interpretation of the language of the Convention of 1825 is likely to considerably restrict their assumed width for the 'Coast strip' may have determined on pushing surveys as a means either of forcing on the question of interpretation or of indefinitely postponing its consideration. It therefore seems desirable to keep this possible motive distinctly in view, a further reason that by formulating & taking some action on our view of the boundary we press the means of forcing the subject of the interpretation of the language of the Convention

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____188____

to a settlement (by means of an agreement or otherwise) into consideration at any time. Further, that bearing of the nature of those which formerly occurred on the Stikine may occur at any moment & may have the same result.

5. It would appear that we are more likely to secure the determination of a boundary satisfactory to Canada by a preliminary adjudication & decision on the wording of the treaty than in any other way. It is therefore worthy of consideration whether any arrangement for joint action in surveys of the 'Coast strip' region may not rather tend to injure our chances of obtaining such an interpretation of the treaty than otherwise

G. M. Dawson

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

11 Feb. 1889

If requested to formulate suggestions as to the course to be pursued with respect to surveys the following might be proposed. —

I. Reply to U.S. proposition that we should complete our surveys of 141 meridian in Yukon region, & that supplementary surveys will probably be undertaken in region of 'Coast strip' but these independently or with such agreement only as the respective surveyors may find convenient in the field.

II Ascertain in Washington exactly what is proposed in the way of equipment &c of surveyors for the Yukon region & make preparations accordingly.

III Arrange an independent scheme for supplementary surveys by one or more parties in 'Coast strip' region & make preparations to despatch them early in May. These surveys will keep us abreast of U.S. in general information & enable us to check such surveys as the U.S. may make, as well as further to define the parts of importance in respect to access to interior &c.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____188____

IV. In addition to arrangements for a hydrographic survey by Admiralty of the southern parts of Prince of Wales Island & vicinity of Pearce & Wales Islands etc, including precise determination of Vancouver's survey marks etc. The necessity for this arises from the fact that the U.S. has during the past season been engaged in surveying the same region with the evident intention of gaining data toward asserting views as to tidal boundary to back of Prince Island.

V. Continuation of any further possible investigations respecting correspondence papers etc relating to the Convention of 1825, in order that there may be ready for presentation at any moment at which the matter may be brought to decision.

VI. Action by way of protest or otherwise to safeguard Canadian interests in heads of inlets penetrating the coast & more particularly with respect to Lynn Canal & Taku Inlet, on which certain trading & other ~~other~~ houses are already established & there appears to be danger of the acquisition of prescriptive rights by the U.S.

G.M.D.

Memos. Submitted
to Gen. Caverns
11. Feb. 89

Rec'd 22 Feb

King Street
Kingston
22 Feb: 1885.

Dear Dawson,

As to marking the Alaskan boundary on your Index Map:

(a) Provided the line be shown as running from 3 to 5 miles from the Ocean Shore between 141° W long and 56 N. Lat: —

(b) provided that with

with respect to inlets no part within a point where waterways do not exceed 6 miles across shall be considered Ocean shore line.

(c) Provided that in running southward the line passes straight from where it first meets 56° N Lat. to the head of Portland Channel

(d) Provided that on its seaward course

through Portland Channel it passes through Pearses Channel but by the NE, N & NW of Fillmore island and out to the ocean between Sitklan and Tongass Islands

(e) & Provided that from the last point it runs straight to the South Coast of Prince W. Island — " to the nearest southernmost Cape.

(f) provided that the

22 July 1889.

Genl Cameron.

Parts (a) & (b) have printed along them ~~that~~ "Boundary under the "Anglo Russian Convention "1825 not yet located:

And that the part (c) has printed along it "Line limiting retention "of Territory under the "Anglo Russian Convention "of 1825".

With the foregoing provisos I see no objection to your noting a line on your map.

If you send me one with the line pencilled I can let you know if any further suggestion occurs to me.

Yours D. R. Cameron

King Street
Kingston
26 Feb: 1889.

Recd. 27. Feb.

Dear Dawson

In your letter of the 22nd inst: you ask me three questions:

To give my opinion

1. whether the line from the head of Portland Channel should follow the summits of the coast mountains from the point where it strikes these in the neighbourhood of Bowsoughs Inlet, or

should

should it follow the summits of the coast mountains only from the point where it arrives near the shore of Ernest Sound?

2. May not a question occur with regard to channel ways between islands & between island and the coast when these ways are not more than 6 miles across?

3. Should data given by Hunter be noted on

on your index map?

Answer: —

1. Since we contend that shores of narrow inlets do not form part of the Ocean coast line indicated in the treaty — I think it will be impossible to find summits of mountains near the coast in the neighbourhood of Bourroughs Inlet which are also on the parallel of 56° N. Lat

I think too that Art: IV

Art: IV (2) Convention 1825 removes any doubt that may be thought to attach to the interpretation of Art: III in this respect.

Art: IV (2) refers to the coast strip along which the summits of the mountains are to be followed as extending
" from the ~~parallel of~~
" 56th degree of N.L. to the
" point of intersection of
" 141st degree W. Long "

The Burroughs Inlet line would run southward and this would be straining

the

the language of the Convention.

Neither of these difficulties can be found in running the line direct from the head of Portland Channel to the mountain top next the sea in 56° N Lat: near Ernest Sound.

2. Where in Continental inlets the presence of an island makes a <u>mare clausum</u> — the mare clausum is within the continental

continental limits – i.e. within the continental coast line.

A case occurs, I believe, in Lynn Canal.

With regard to islands not affecting inlets, the Treaty description of the coast strip may be considered as ~~leaving~~ intended to indicate such a line as might have been described had no such islands off the

continental coast existed: The islands off the coast and the continental strip were dealt with by the negotiators separately — and not as necessarily attached to one another by common sovereignty

3. I see no great objection to your note "Provisional Boundary J. Hunter 1899" — on the map. Were I to suggest any change in this — it would be with a view to emphasizing

the fact that Hunters line is in no sense a boundary: it is simply a temporary arrangement between the governments to prevent friction until a boundary is settled.

It is much more a temporary customs limit pending determination of a boundary — than a provisional boundary.

I don't know whether it is sanctioned by anything of greater authority than agreement between the two governments — and, if this be all, I doubt much whether the law courts could settle

settle the jurisdictional point — if raised — in which country a crime committed there occurred.

Yours very sincerely
D. R. Cameron

P.S. I should prefer to note on the map "Temporary customs "limit pending the "determination of the "Treaty boundary."

D. C.

26 July 1889.

Cameron

private letters

on showing a

boundary etc

Recd. 4 March

King St., Kingston
3 March
1889

Dear Dawson,

I now return, as requested by you, the proof of an Index Map, and of a portion of a larger map sent to me

On the margin of the former I have pencilled ~~these~~ remarks supplementary to what I have already written to you — but with which you are already familiar

as

3 Mch 1887.

—

Genl. Cameron.

—

as expressing my
views

Yours very truly
D. R. Jameson

Private

Winnipeg, 31st Aug., 1889.

My dear Dr. Dawson,

Thanks for your favour of the 23rd ultimo with its enclosure, which latter I now return. It is somewhat amusing to observe Mr. Dall's explanations of the reasons for issuing the proclamation respecting the Behring Sea, in the light of the seizures and other events which have since taken place. I fancy that Mr. Blaine finds himself today in a pretty difficult position. Evidently the British Government is dead against him. The Canadian Government certainly is, and it appears that even the weight of opinion in the United States - if the newspapers are a good index of that opinion - is against the course which he is pursuing.

I quite agree with you as to the damaging effect of the continued uncertainty in regard to the silver and lead mines in the Railway Belt, and, in strict confidence, may say to you that my proposition to Mr. Dewdney was that we should pay

a

Geo. M. Dawson, Esq., Ph. D.,
Geological Survey,
Kamloops, B.C.

a money consideration to the Province for a right which, after all, is of very little value to them.

I am, as you see, again in the North West, and expect to visit Prince Albert, Battleford and Edmonton beforeI return. Just where I may leave the railway, and what I shall do is at present somewhat uncertain.

Hoping that you have had a good season, and that you are in good health, as I am glad to say this leaves me,

Believe me,

My dear Dr. Dawson,

Yours faithfully,

A. M. Burgess

W. H. Dall
so very

Recd. at Kamloops
12 July

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

S. P. LANGLEY, Secretary
G. BROWN GOODE, Assistant Secretary,
in charge of U. S. National Museum

UNITED STATES NATIONAL MUSEUM

Washington, May 30 1889.

My dear Dr. Dawson,

Your kind letter is at hand. I shall be very glad to have the maps, and, if possible to spare it, another copy of the text. I gave mine to I. C. Russell, who left last Saturday for the Yukon to do what geologizing he can with the boundary party sent out by the Coast Survey. He could not get another in time, and I thought perhaps you could spare another. Some of your people seem to be rather excited about the late proclamation about Bering Sea, judging by the newspapers. It ought to be generally known that the issuance of that proclamation was purely perfunctory, obligated by a paragraph in a bill passed without sufficient scrutiny by the last

Congress in the confusion of the last few days of its existence. The paragraph was doubtless inserted at the instance of the Alaska Com'l Co's agent here. I do not think anyone in this country whose opinion has any value, except as an attorney, upholds the view that the rights of the U.S. in the seals extend beyond the three mile limit. But if they would exterminate these animals London would suffer more than San Francisco, as I believe about 20,000 people in one way or another derive their support from the dying & dressing of the skins in London. Some international agreement should settle it.

I may add that the discrepancy you note about the opening of the Yukon, in my book of 1870, arose not from any desire to claim a discovery not due to our people, but merely to claim the decisive publication of it to the scientific world. Those who knew it through Lukeen and others kept it secret. It was to be found on some maps, but not on some later ones, and by the Hudson Bay Co's people in 1865 was discussed with Kennicott & the other leaders of the Expedition, as an unsettled question. When our people got to Fort Yukon the H.B. men there thought the Yukon emptied at the Colville mouth in the Arctic Ocean a view cherished by the chief traders to prevent desertions. Yours sincerely

Wm H. Dall

Possession most important
but in disputed boundary
settlers e.g. Zambesi,
acquiring prescriptive rights
by effective occupation.

—

Real question now to decide
principles of delimitation
by interpretation of treaty.

—

Conferences were practically
on 4 6 & 8 Feb.

FROM THE

GEOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY OF CANADA.

OTTAWA.

Notes on Dall's letter to Mr Bayard
13 Feb. 88

1. Right of navigable Canadian waters recognized as a reciprocal concession. Really included in right of free navn. of Stikine for us but not in other U.S. case.

2. "Sub-arctic interior" country recognized by us as possible to cede not properly comparable with country N. of 54 40 in Alaska

3. Note really prepared & addressed to Sir C. Tupper but this meant for purpose of showing some case to facilitate discussions

4. Dall's first suggestion for boundary.

Notes on Klotz Report.
dated Preston 11. Dec. 89.

---

of interest as other than forms report. P. 1 p. 1 might be modified

p. 2. Travelled incognito!

Confid. Information required, relating to heads of tribes, not obtained & means of communication with natives

p. 14. P 3 from bottom. What other wars. unknown.

p. 15. Original French version of treaty preferable

p. 17. Legislative Council in treaty for Pop W. Island may be assumed better from Vancouver (see his map)

pp 17–18 Scarcity of women leads to fighting. Cannibalism defined by this.

of B.C. Exhortations to which as was afterwards very complaining

p. 20. refutes B.C. argument & attempts to which fact unnecessary & very complimentary of Kanaka.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY,

Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., L.L.D., F.R.S., Director.

MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX ST., OTTAWA.

_____ *188*____

p. 25: etc. contains statements in Alask. Coast Pilot entirely wrong by which Russia & Canada.

pp 27-28 practically justifies Canada as to great Lynn Canal & Portland Inlet

Inaccuracies as to very wrong 'mountains' in Coast Pilot may be apparent. p. 31-38.

p. 38 last P not correct.

p. 39. Correct enough

p 40 Canada straight

p. 41 ambiguous & expedient to admit from that to begin boundary impracticable. but called on to do so. By does not show expansion of ideas in minds of negotiators which would be supposed in other descriptions.

p. 42. speaks of 'obtrusive coast line' very expressive & our idea present.

p. 43. Straight line boundary need not be fixed except by reference points in first instance. The dependency of crest points, even by chart & coast might lead to interminable discussions

p. 44 pressure that Poyster blend
telegr. ability & Russia may have
another meaning (See B.L. line)

— Seems a strong & strict not different
lines'y argument from those already
adopted.

— pp 45–46. does not require claim
made tickets.

— Judge from Cannon's report evidently,
but presumes to warn his colleagues
when he hears. This judicial decision
not called for.

p. 48 Zaal & see where Argyll got idea that
opposition made without in danger.

— p. 50 Doll saw too polite when y S.E.
alarmed them Klotz, necessarily. better
modify this which may be turned against
him

— p. 51 trouble not bad.

— p. 52 admits wandering too readily.

p. 53. Sure y these references may be specific.

p. 59. 3 P. Was there this needed

— p. 61. Think that unnecessary & fix
actual (time) features with great
accuracy, just

p.61. Principle of adhering to
boundary boundary right through. Idea
of conventional boundary, however, to
effect immediate settlement (taking
heads of islands) without any or if
any very small loss of territory
as compared with our scheme
arbitration. Wisdom in fact that
this scheme or closest arbitration will
seem to admitted.

By sacrificing straight line
boundary along heads of islands,
or of conv. boundary for i. some
advantages in detaching them
scheme arbitration of closest mountain
boundary.

General on Report on Phys. features
General on information needed & not got.

Secretary on
[illegible]

p. 14 ¶ 5 & 6. I think these paragraphs give the idea that South-Eastern Alaska (= Coast strip) has a considerable width. My view is that South Eastern Alaska has no 'interior' The strip flows a few miles across S.E. Alaska to reach the sea. It is further to be maintained that the entire courses of the Tolku & Chilkat are Canadian, including the heads of inlets into which they discharge.

p. 15. It appears to be important for several reasons that we should refer in all cases to the original French version of the Convention relating to boundary, not to the English translation as here done

General matters on the whole of this memorandum

Wells U.S. Report
Enclosed
Despatch of E. Cameron

p. 20 & 21. Refuses or attempts to refute the B.C. contention, as the B.C. govt. has officially asked Can. govt. to support that contention & as it might possibly be employed as an 'outwork' even if not seriously maintained, we may well leave the refutation of this to U.S.

p. 22 The Capuino which has been produced by Charges name Portland Channel & obs. Lost by Vancouver, has been very ~~ver~~ poorly described already by Cameron, who gives very strong Reasons by Vancouver's books & red line &c. I believe that Credit is due for this discovery to Cameron & cannot see that Klotz adds anything of importance to what Cameron has written on it.

p. 25 – P 4 & p. 27 except last P. useful as showing Capuino introduced in Alaska Coast pilot

p. 27 last P & first part of p. 28 practically quotes Cameron's report as to first Circle line from S part Prince W Island & Portland Channel.

p. 28 2nd ¶ to p 31 3rd ¶ on connection of line from head of Portland Canal to the point at which it reaches 56 11. Commissioners I think said all that can be usefully said on this subject.

p. 31 last ¶. I believe that geographers would hold an elevation of 1000 feet sufficient to constitute a mountain for purposes of definition.

p. 31 ¶ 38. Here extracts from Alaska Coast Pilot may be useful for reference. I think however that we should not too readily accept A.P.C. definition of limits as for purpose of line country just we intend court to verify what we should ~~want~~ contend for. Also discussion of points on Taku Inlet, Seymour Canal etc gives impression that we are looking for a line round these inlets & ~~but~~ do not claim their heads.

pp. 18-19. References & Comments
Report (information posted without
acknowledgment) renders Rlty W's.
as confidential as the report.

p. 38 last ¶: This statement does not coincide with the fact, much of Alaska is a level low country, with only scattered ranges of hills or mountains. Nothing whatever is known of country b. N. of St Elias alps between Chilkat R. (Krause) & Copper R. (Allen)

p. 41. P. S. Doubt advisability of characterizing alternative boundary as utterly & entirely impracticable. We are not called on to do so, Mr. Wrangell to prove that both alternative boundaries impracticable & in this statement we unnecessarily allow them help of their contention.

p. 42 P. S.: We should never admit in terms that we have to follow an "irregular & labyrinthine coast line". This is entirely destructive of general Cameron's idea of the parallelism to the ocean coast, which should be maintained if at all possible.

p. 42. last p. Petroff's suggestion for boundary has never been backed up or seriously advanced by anyone but himself. It is scarcely worth alluding to it seriously.

p. 43 p 3 to 44/2 Her Maj. opinions on this subject must respectful consideration. It may be said however (1) that only a limited number of posts in a geographic line would require to be fixed by on the various avenues to the interior. (2) that great difficulty will be experienced in many cases in deciding which natural posts are to constitute the boundary. Experience shows that no sparing compromise or concession need be anticipated on the side of US. I need only in this view refer to Mr. Angle L. Glowards.

p. 44. P 3 p. 45 p. 2. This conclusion appears to be well based. Would remark, however, that B.C. first insists. takes the position that P of W Island

shall belong wholly to Russia ~~to imply that~~ as part of proof that line should go northward along it up Clarence Strait.

p. 45. P 3. ~~the~~ S.S. Alaska has practically no interior. We maintain that it is a narrow coast strip.

p. 46. P 1. We are not prepared to allow as here done that Wh. has right to shores of Lynn Canal.

p. 47 p. 3. – p 49 P 2. Argell's treatment of boundary question in Forum is too sketchy & incomplete to require serious consideration.

p. 49 P 3 to end of p 58. ~~Much~~ Most of this is pertinent & likely to be useful. Dalls statements regarding the boundary ~~are~~ on pp 49 - 50 do are loose & misleading. At same time think issue

Should not be taken with him as ~~[illegible]~~ exact definition of E.E. Alaska, as this says the water open to upwards. Dall I believe practically with the A.C.S. which permits to pass guided from Sea of the dog fenced up & down Coast in way to Nulato for nine years he has had a chance of seeing 9 times as much as the writer of this book. —

Also p. 52 p. 2 ~~[illegible]~~ of the coast strip runs parallel to ocean coast as we calculated it will not "meander in many directions". —

Also p 52 P. 41 refer again to found of flesh in Sapwoods. Need not Comstock anything else though was carefully spelt to be looked for.

p. 59 Though not exactly in the same order this what Early became apparent at Washington. Treaty must be definitely interpreted & line of action laid down before field work of fixing boundary. It is very doubtful how, whether two Commissioners could arrive at complete agreement on these points. Points on which no agreement would have to be compromised or some person would for their arbitration. This is the first step & an important one to take at once. If not taken at once, must in my defence claim to claim now about of County. This will not facilitate, but merely enable us to maintain our rights as against ~~total~~ advantage of local knowledge being accumulated by U.S.

Memo. on Review of Klotz

Jan 1890

General remark on introduction of Commrs's private report —

Klotz may commit a trifle to certain views. These depend on a few or so attractive propositions already admitted in the argument by us.

3 This inference is not justified. In fact distinctly stated by me (p — that not binding of Canadian not impracticable. Discussion of int. boundary would ~~have~~ had no object. U.S. & Can. later opinions gets interpretation. No means provided for remarks here. (See C Tupper) object as explained (p — to Salisbury if possible to readjust on principles generally advance

clearly labelled that might fall back on this. Purpose of discussions, as explained by Sir C Tupper.

5 We are not called upon either to admit or contest this statement for which Mr Bayard is responsible.

6-18 The whole of this criticism refers to a memo.? debate — addressed by Dall to Moore. This memo.

was handed I saw in printed form when I first met Mrs Dall & was apparently intended as a "bolter d'essai" written under the assumption that we knew little about the matter in discussion. It was not strongly advanced or backed up by argument as reports by Dall & self in blue papers show. It is often to such extremes as that clinched quoted it by Mrs Kloß, but under the other circumstances this was not thought necessary. The letter addressed by Mr & Mrs C Jeffers under date of — was envisaged a sufficient answer showing as it does how entering the ~~Bodach~~ Cave their differs from that of US in interpretation of the language of the Convention.

This interpretation advanced after discussion & should not be attributed to Kloß.

19 Dr quotations here made from my letter to Mr C. Jeffers of —. The view as to meaning of ocean event mentioned by Cameron is adopted. I believe this hour should be strenuously mentioned by Trustees & it

~~existence~~ as based on "the history & special geth Connection" appears to me to be tenable. I cannot thus entering dissent from Mr Klotz conclusions of it given at length in P 20 – 28 & would further point out that if Canons bars as to the ocean coast is to be maintained, the mere existence of Mr Klotz calculations as here given may have a most damaging effect.

of ~~special~~ remarks on special points referred to in ~~the last~~ this paragraphs, 20 - 21. I am in a position to state ~~xxxx~~ from personal observation that most if not all the ridges, ranges & crests of mountains or other elevations are more nearly & uniformly parallel to the main ocean coast than to the "sea-waters edge" including shores of inlets. p. 24. This argument is advanced by Dall (p –) but is easily refuted as the ~~water~~ experience is to the Canadian coast line throughout. p. 27. The statement here quoted from Sir C. Begot's letter shows that it ~~was~~ intended to

secure to Britain the "Embouchures" of the rivers & in itself goes far to show that it was intended to secure the inlets into which the rivers flowed which may be considered as such "Embouchures" & represent the Cultivation of the same valleys as occupied by the rivers themselves. These inlets are as much rivers as the Saguenay gives its mouth to Hudson Bay.

pp 29–32 Lord Hardy may be willing to concede that which would be considered satisfactory by the Others, but each may be at liberty to state views held. Severe reasons which might render a contract lines like those named 1 & 2 advisable are given in the report of Engineers (p. 9) Others might be adduced, the principal of which is that it appears only by some such change of boundaries possible to settle this. or for to recede from their extreme claim as to ~~colour as the~~ cannot now claim to trade of inlets.

This is really more important than any small loss of no of square miles of territory. It does not however, follow that we should now identically lose any territory by the adoption of such contested lines. This depends entirely on the selection of the governing points, which owing to doubtful phrases of US. & Can. necessarily left an open question.

~~pp 33~~.

P 34. Nothing is yet known about the County School thus St Elias alps & it cannot therefore be characterized as "sub-arctic wilds" with any safety. Such slight information as can be gleaned yet from the Indians goes to show that it is well timbered & a good ~~fur land~~ game country at least. The secure of carrying out the triangulation now appears to concurrently or at least of forming in the work in Yukon & Yeggard Canadian interests need not be great.

P. 35 – & 71 Mr Dalles memoir (letters?)
here entirely wrong put words place in (Inverness & pers)
They should have doubtless be carefully discussed
& reported on. Gen. Cameron having made the
subjects his own & ~~being~~
being personally responsible for some of the criticisms
contributed by Dalle is not fitted to prepare
such a discussion, which depends, almost entirely on
the documentary evidence which he has collected in
his report. –

P 72 & ~~[illegible]~~ 78. These details of calculation ~~for for a S.S.~~ calculation stop Cameron naturally
~~[illegible]~~ depend on the interpretation which may eventually
be arrived at of the working of the Commission, or in
the definition of some combined view. Such fundamental
points settled I should agree with Mr Kloff that he
need hardly need be bothered in playing bandy words
in accordance therewith.

Jany 1890.

Robert Klotz's report.

[illegible] cryptococcus

[illegible] Mr Doll was to

[illegible] [illegible] with any

[illegible] as [illegible] the [illegible] of

[illegible] not only satisfactory

[illegible] [illegible] of which

[illegible] [illegible] for such

[illegible] possible [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] cryptococcus

[illegible] [illegible] in regard the

[illegible] of the mortem body.

[illegible] as a possible [illegible]

[illegible] if expedient, a

[illegible] this was taken up

[illegible] general principles of

[illegible] this might be

[illegible] [illegible] of agreement

[illegible] of [illegible]

A reference to my previous report on the Yukon District etc will show that after a careful exploration of a considerable part of the island Cody my opinion of its values is much greater than that entertained by Mr Kloty, who has now sent it

The main ob
between myself a
ascertain whether
would entertain
the question Sec
line could
could obviate th
discussion & the
of the text of the
arbitrators for
(See the 2 pub P
p. 7)
Have therefore pl
Canadian bren
~~the discussion~~
& we I be rendered
discussion of ob
& in respect to
which such allen
seemed a fear
which might show us

negotiating
bar
Rocha

MB

copy

Office of the
Minister of Justice.
Ottawa, 3rd January, 1890.

My dear Mr. Dewdney,

I have read General Cameron's letter which I return herewith. I think that the mistakes which he has pointed out ought to be corrected, but not in the way he suggests.

I think that the General should make the corrections in a letter to you. The one enclosed would be sufficient except for its suggestions concerning Mr. Dawson, and perhaps

enc.

The Hon.ble
Edgar Dewdney,
Minister of the Interior.

perhaps, might suffice even with that, although, if it is to be treated as formal and official the General might wish to consider the subject and treat it more fully. There might also be a letter from Mr. Dawson to you.

These, I think, might form the basis of a report by you to the Government to be transmitted through the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office and thence to Washington.

Mr. Wells mistake in assuming that we have agreed to something which we repudiate might, as the General suggests, be rather

embarrassing

embarrassing; and being attached to the President's message, will be on record in the Foreign Office and the correctness of it will hereafter be assumed unless we set things right.

Yours faithfully,
Sgd, Jno. S. D. Thompson.

3 Jany 1890.

Sir J. S. S. Thompson

re Dalli's mistakes

50.

Rec'd 7. Jan.

Enc:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
CANADA

Ottawa. 4th Jany 1890

My dear Dr Dawson,

I enclose you copy of a letter which I have received from Sir John Thompson, dated the 3rd instant. You will recollect I told you yesterday I had submitted General Cameron's letter to him. I think his suggestion a good one, and would like you to act on it. I am sending a copy of Sir John Thompson's letter to General Cameron also.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

T. Mowat

Dr Geo. M. Dawson,
Geological Survey,
Ottawa.

5 Jany 1890.

Genl. Cameron

re errnsci & doc

No 146.

OFFICE OF
UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE,
CANADA.

Recd 7 Jan.

Kingston
5 Jany. '90

Dear Denison,

I have received your note of the 3d inst. about mistakes in Ex: Doc: 146 — 50th Congress 2d Session.

To your list of errors you may add

Page: 5 —
Line 8 from top
and 4 from bottom } For
"Se pourra" read
"ne pourra".

P. 7 — line 16 —
For "Purce" read
"Pearse"

p. 10 – Remove the doubt as to whether the paragraph following that marked (2) is a ~~the~~ criticism by Mr. Dall – or a statement by him of your view.

p. 11. Footnote – Was the communication made by you "in order that "these views should be "clearly put on record"?

p 23 Line 11 from top – is presumably a quotation from the U.S. Constitution (see p 37 two lines from bottom): but the word "Simosities" has

been substituted for "winding" — The French word "sinuosités" is the synonym of the English word "winding".

p 34 – Line 3 from bottom in the French for "cera" read "sera".

p 24 – Line 11 from bottom
For "only be a survey"
read "only by a survey".

p 26 – Line 4 from bottom —
For "sinuosités" if a quotation, read "winding".

p. 38 – Line 12 – The French "et remonte en ligne directe, sans "limitation, vers le Nord, jusqu'à "ce qu'elle se perde dans la mer "glaciale" — is not correctly translated in the U.S. version

"and proceed ~~north~~ due
" north, without limitation,
" into the same Frozen Ocean".

There may be other errors — but none of the foregoing nor those noted by you are, in my opinion, of a kind to lead to weakening of the British contention — They are errors which may avoid Conference for correction — as admission of their incorrectness must be conceded when they are pointed out. By leaving them unnoticed no injury can accrue. The case is different in the instances* I pointed out to Mr Dewdney

Yours very sincerely
D R Cameron

* by purport to be officially communicated statements of contentions advanced by Canada.

Recd 11 Jany.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF CANADA

Kingston, Ont. 10 Jany 1890.

Dear Dawson,

I had intended to postpone replying to your last until I had drafted my answer to Mr Dewdney.

This morning I have received a fresh batch of papers and I therefore conclude to thank you without more delay as I do not know when my letter to Mr Dewdney will be ready. I have not seen anything in the papers I have received to alter my views expressed in my old printed report.

I do not, at present, think of

of doing more than showing
in what respects facts erroneously
assumed by Mr Dall are evident
in his report (Ex: Doc: 146) and
cannot be foundation for
conclusions he draws.

My idea is that a fuller
explanation may be necessary
to elucidate for foreign office
consideration, — but this
is wholly apart from
the necessity there is to
correct misquotations in
the Ex: Doc:

Very truly
Yours Sincerely
D R Cameron

10 January 1890.

Genl Cameron.

GEOLOGICAL & NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S., Director.
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX STREET, OTTAWA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CANADA.

dept, but personal

private.

January 28 1890

Dear Lord Cameron,

I have to thank you for your note of the 10th. In the matter of the corrections I shall now wait till I hear further from you. Mr Dawson has given me to read a report of Mr Klotz on "Alaska" together with a printed "Review of Mr Ogilvie's report on the Principal of Lds. etc" by the same. I understand that you have also been furnished with copies of these, & there can be no impropriety in my expressing my views to you personally that in the introduction of Mr Klotz & his arguments at the present time there appears to me to be some danger of bungling the whole thing. While basing many of his arguments on yours or on the correspondence contained in your confidential report (which you will remember it was thought best to make no allusion to at present) on other points he appears to strive after originality. He deprecates the idea of any loss of territory by the adoption of a conventional

Conventional line & at the same time attacks your contention as to our right to heads of inlets rightly (see p. 2 of printed Review) when this if it can be maintained, is most vital to us. If by any chance copies of these documents should get into army hands they might fall like a bomb-shell into a conference.

What work I have done in the matter I have considered as supplementary to yours & as leading up to it, & considering that the preliminary statement of a case as outlined in my letter to Sir C. Tupper was thoroughly discussed by all concerned I fail to see just what good purpose is to be served by the present criticism. Since yr the peaks looked up in Alaska Coast Pilot etc regarding the use of the term mountains etc may be of service & his views as a surveyor on the feasibility of running a line are of course worthy of respectful attention, while his account of the physical features of the coast accords very well with my memo. on the same written for Sir C. Tupper. ~~Even his~~ & in so far his report would appear (in ~~account of his trip, however, he had no more chance of studying these features in detail (if anything less chance) than I.~~ ~~but often be.~~ with perhaps recent

Thus I regard work as a private explanation to you personally. I shall of course endeavour to do what I can whenever called on, in the matter & shall endeavour particularly to remain in ~~through~~ complete accord with your line of work

Kingston
17 January '90

Dear Dr. Dawson

I find I should have answered your last note by return of mail — for my anticipation that I might give you a definite reply after a days or two has proved ill founded.

Since your note reached me — I have waded through a lot of United States correspondence — & have not yet completed my

my task .. The few crumbs of information I have gleaned tend to confirm the views I advanced in my report to the Colonial Office — certainly nothing I have come across points the other way.

I have been placed in somewhat of a difficulty as you too have been. First there was Kloth report on the line — and then his review of the Washington work.

It is rather hard to have to deal with the latter — and my sympathy is with you on this point. However it may not prove a disadvantage to have to discuss opposition amongst Canadians provided care be taken not to supply the enemy with Canadian weapons.

Yours very sincerely
D. R. Cameron

P.S. When I have written my official letters to

to Mr Dewdney — the line I take will be communicated to you. At present — I think that Klotz has fallen into an error about the crest of the mountains which are situated parallely to the coast.

I certainly do not quite understand his argument about the Ocean — unless it be that he adopts Dall's attempted demonstration that my case carried to its legitimate conclusion would throw the coast line outside many islands on the coast. But this is at once met by the circumstance that the line treated of is expressly stated to be the <u>continental</u> line in the Convention — ORH

S.O.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DIEU ET MON DROIT
CANADA

enc

Recd. 25 Jan

Ottawa, Jan. 23rd, 1890.

Dear Dr. Dawson,

I enclose extract from a letter received by me from His Honor Judge Walkem, of Victoria, B. C., in relation to the Alaska Boundary question.

Yours sincerely,

N. W. Thrupe for an accounting from your allies & will soon be about again.

E.S.

Dr. George M. Dawson,

Geological Survey.

Extract from a letter from Geo. A. Walkem, dated Victoria, January 16th 1890, to, The Honourable, E. Dewdney Minister of the Interior.

With respect to the Alaska Bdy. question care may be required to see that old Hudson Bay or other charts incorrectly placing Portland Channel - as an inlet of the Mainland - far to the South East of its true position, are not introduced or used by the U. S. authorities. Hudson Bay employes here can show how these inaccuracies occured and when they existed. The point may be of great

importance

importance, and may, by the way, when sifted, possibly give a greater value to Mrs Gray's charts than Sir John thinks they possess.

23 Jan 1890.

In re Walkem
re
Alaska Boundary
Question.

Notes on the Physical features of part of the west Coast of North America in their relation to the question of the Boundary line between Alaska & Canada.

~~The information available for~~ That part of the Coast extending from the 141st Meridian south eastward to Cross Sound — a distance of about 200 miles — appears to offer comparatively little difficulty in regard to the definition of the boundary as described in the Convention of 1825. The best information available tends to show that there exists a nearly continuous & well marked range of high mountains, beginning to the north west in Mt St Elias, & terminating in Mount La Perouse, & that between this range & the Coast, the country is not generally mountainous, but consists rather of a nearly uniform Plateau. This range appears further to consist in part or entirely of volcanic mountains, & is so differs altogether in character from that north

New party line Sacredly defined

in the vicinity of the Coast to the southward.

It may be assumed that the boundary-line would naturally follow the crest of this range where not exceeding ~~the~~ 10 leagues from the Coast; & judging from the U.S. Coast Survey map of Alaska (1884) would be at an average distance of less than fifteen miles from the Coast for the greater part of its length, or from of Yakutat Bay & Cross Sound.

Ranges may be irregular

It is to be remarked, however, in this connexion, that the range or ranges here bordering the Coast are likely to prove ~~more~~ more rather than less irregular than represented on the maps, & that there is reason to believe that one or possibly two or more streams rising in the vicinity of the ~~Chilkat~~ head of Chilkat River, pass completely through the range to the Coast. It is uncertain whether this river or these rivers reach the Coast in Yakutat Bay or on the part of the Coast between that ~~bay~~ bay & Cape Fairweather. Reports obtained from

Indians during the past summer, point to the existence of at least one such river reaching the last-described part of the coast, by which the journey is accomplished between the head of the Chilkat & the coast. It may also be added that Mr Seton-Karr, who visited the slopes of Mt. St. Elias in 1886 believes the summit of this mountain to be considerably further inland than ten leagues (Proc. R. Geog. Soc. Aug 87) though his opinion respecting the position of this point is considered as based on insufficient evidence, by Mr W.H. Dall (P.R.G.S. July 87)

Position of Mt St Elias

I am in general knowledge of the part of the coast above referred to.

Character of Coast S. from Cross Sound

Southward from the vicinity of Cross Sound, the Alaska Coast resembles in general character that of the

~~adjacent~~ contiguous ~~neighbouring~~ northern part of the Coast of B.C., though showing at the same time some peculiar features in respect to width of waterways etc which bear on special bearing on the question of boundary. This Coast & its adjacent islands must be regarded as portions of the wide mountain belt of the Pacific coast in a partially submerged condition, in which the lower valleys are represented by straits, sounds etc. The shores are everywhere bold & generally formed by steep wooded or rocky mountain slopes rising abruptly from the sea. There is in fact scarcely any flat land bordering on the Coast, with the exception of that contained in low valleys ~~running inland from the heads of inlets or sounds~~ forming the submerged inland continuation of inlets, sounds etc.

Coast Mountains

~~Though~~ The ~~general~~ main direction of the Coast belt of mountains

is remarkably uniform, & ~~their~~ general ~~geographical~~ geological & physical features similar all the way from the Fraser R to the Chilkoot Pass, but none of the existing maps show even approximately the positions of the ~~[illegible]~~ innumerable ~~[illegible]~~ constituent ranges & ridges of this wide mountain region. Though the constituent ridges preserve in ~~[illegible]~~ the majority of cases an approximate parallelism to the direction of the mountainous belt they ~~change~~ diverge widely from it in other instances & detached ocean of so broken & tumultuous a character that it is scarcely possible to observe any ruling direction. A good idea of the ~~[illegible]~~ amount of regularity in direction of the mountain ranges, may be gathered from an inspection of the outlines of the channels & straits bordering the Coast. As previously remarked these occupy main structural valleys in the partially

3500
1500
2000

1500
4500
13
10

15000
4500
19500
2100
21500

Coast-mountains bordering it

submerged portion of the mountain region, & they are usually bordered by more or less continuous ranges in the direction of their length. Exceptions to this however, occur in the Cove of Tokeen Inlet, ~~[illegible]~~ & other transverse valleys, which break across the component mountain ridges.

Whether the 'Coast' line of the Convention, therefore, be taken to refer to the Coast exclusive of the shores of the penetrating inlets, or whether the shores of these long inlets be included under the term, there need never be any difficulty in finding ~~a~~ ranges or ridges of mountains immediately bordering ~~the Coast~~ on it, & the crests of these ~~the [illegible] crest of which~~ mountains would usually be at a distance of three to five miles only from the shores. These ranges or ridges bordering the shores are, however, not continuous, ~~being~~

ranges not continuous

~~room possibly in some cases for much difference of opinion~~ & though an independent & impartial study of the topography on the ground would probably result in the determining without difficulty the ~~of~~ proper course of the line in leaving the range & passing to the east, these interruptions might leave much room for argument & difference of opinion if ~~viewed~~ regarded from ~~different~~ opposite points of view. In determining such a line it would therefore be ~~desirable~~ necessary to formulate in advance some general rule for guidance in such cases of interruption.

Notes from personal observation

To illustrate this point the following notes from personal observation may be given. — Both west & east sides of Lynn Canal are bounded by remarkably ~~straight~~ direct

& definite ranges, ~~but~~ but to the north, the Canal terminates in two diverging valleys, for crossing which some special rule ~~could~~ might have to be applied. On the east side of the Lynn Canal, a short distance from its head, the Skagua River, & a few miles further south a second stream, break through the eastern bordering range, but can scarcely be regarded as effecting its general continuity. Still further south, on the east side, is Berner's Bay, 4½ miles wide. The eastern bordering range of the Canal slopes down to ~~a point~~ the north entrance point of the bay, & so far as I was able to observe, the seats of one or two distinct ridges abut on the north shore of the bay, & a comparatively low tract ~~of land~~ runs inland from its head. In tracing a line from

point & first across the ends of ridges & between ~~[illegible]~~ more or less isolated elevations round the head of the bay, some difficulty might be found.

South of Berners Bay, the immediate Coast as far as Eastineaux Channel is bordered by rather low, irregular wooded hills, behind which, ~~at a distance of say probably 10 or 12 miles inland~~ & running parallel with the general line of the Coast, is a high & seemingly continuous range, carrying much permanent snow. The crest of this range is at a distance of probably ~~about~~ 10 or 12 miles from the shore. Its base comes out upon the shore, ~~about~~ nearly opposite the middle of Douglas Island, & its crest is at a distance of from 3 & 5 miles only from the shore from that point to the North Entrance

point of Tokeh Inlet.

Tokeh Inlet, as already mentioned, appears to cut across round of the Continental ranges of the Coast mountains. As in the case of Berners Bay, it would be comparatively easy to agree upon a line drawn across its entrance, from bordering Coast range to bordering Coast range, but ~~[illegible]~~ possibly difficult to agree upon a line ~~[illegible]~~ following along its shores from point to point of abutting ridges & crossing intervening valleys.

South of Tokeh Inlet there is an apparently continuous high snowy range with summits 10 or 12 miles from the Coast, running past the head of Port Snettisham & towards the head of Holkham Bay. South of Holkham Bay & Fredericks Sound the mountains are much

more broken & irregular than before, & though there may be a ~~[illegible]~~ continuous range parallel to the Coast at some distance inland, the weather was too cloudy & unable me to see it.

Though I have ~~[illegible]~~ twice passed along the Coast between the mouth of the ~~[illegible]~~ Stikine & Dixons Entrances, the mountains were on both occasions covered of clouds so as to prevent any general ~~[illegible]~~ view. What could be seen of them, however, appears to indicate, that there is here a somewhat confused mass of ranges & ridges, much more irregular than those to the northward. The complicated outlines of the sea-filled valleys of this portion of the Coast, seems to confirm this, & though from the bold character of the Coast,

here as elsewhere there ~~would~~ need never be any difficulty in ~~selecting~~ connecting the summits of mountains which rise everywhere abruptly at a ~~short~~ short distance from the shore, the line to draw would ~~be~~ become an extremely complicated & ~~impracticable~~ difficult character if an attempt were made to follow the tortuous outlines of the narrow inlets. Such a line as that last described can surely never have been intended by the wording of the Convention, as the complicated form of the penetrating inlets was almost as well known at the time, by Vancouvers charts, as it is at present & the impracticable character of such a line would have been equally apparent.

lines which could not have been intended

The same remark would apply to an interpretation of the ~~Canadian~~ treaty which would ~~make~~ fix the boundary line or any portion of it at a distance of 10 leagues

from the Coast & parallel to the shores of the penetrating inlets. Such a line must have been seen of the line of the Rocky, quite apparently, upon reference to the existing maps, the most inconvenient possible, ~~in~~ in a mountainous & often nearly impenetrable region such as the Coast is now known to be. Indeed it would be, in my opinion next to impossible to define or survey ~~it~~ such a line.

Line following axial range

A line following the Culminating ~~range~~ or axial range of the belt of Coast mountains might without much difficulty be defined in a general way by an unbiased observer. I have been able to define & indicate thus generally the position of the axis of the Culmination of the same mountain belt when I have examined it near the 51st, 53rd & 55th parallels of north latitude. Such a dominant range can be made

out where the Stikine ~~crosses~~ traverses the mountains. It was again seen (from a distance) crossing the line of the Tokee Valley, apparently not far beyond the head of Tokee Inlet. It would be represented by the watershed on the Chilkoot Pass, but from that point the boundary line turning to the south-westward, ~~extends~~ runs almost directly athwart the trend of the mountain ranges. It is, however, quite improbable that ~~such a range exists~~ a continuous & unbroken axial range exists from the vicinity of ~~Portland Canal~~ Dixon Entrance all the way to the Chilkoot Pass — a distance of over 300 miles — & more likely that an axial or culminating character is taken up in turn by different more or less discontinuous, partly ~~imbricating~~ overlapping or Echelon-like ranges, in which case arbitrary lines would have

to be selected joining these, a mode of procedure ~~certain~~ likely to give rise to much difference of opinion. It would further, for obvious reasons, often be difficult to define such a line in detail & with minute accuracy, whereas the boundary-line requires to be thus defined, in view of the probable discovery of metalliferous deposits in its vicinity. A further difficulty in connexion with such a line ~~is~~ arises from the circumstance that it would probably be necessary to ~~resort~~ revert to the co-lateral limit for a considerable part of the whole distance, in consequence of the ~~distance~~ devations of the axial range from the main coast line. On the southern parallels before referred to it is at an average distance of fully sixty miles ~~from~~ inland from the main coast line.

accuracy in line required

too great distance of axis.

A comparatively simple method, however, of deciding

simple mode of deciding

on such a line as that now in question, would be to define it as a watershed line between the drainage areas of the small streams flowing to the Coast & those flowing in the opposite direction or joining the upper parts of the larger rivers which cut through the whole belt of Coast mountains or through the greater part of it. The Stikine & Taku are known cases of such large rivers, but there may be others which we are not yet in a position to name. One such, reported to be nearly equal to the Taku in size, is said to flow into Port Snettisham. By determining the crossing of the axial range with such rivers in the first instance, & subsequently the line of watershed between the streams forming them on the two sides of the axial range, a sinuous but sufficiently definite line might be located.

All the plans & profiles which I have seen of Bell & Onverge possible.

All expensive & tedious but first

with the exception of the first-mentioned — by that of ~~marking~~ defining the boundary-line by the crests of mountains contiguous to the main Coast line & exclusive of the penetrating inlets — all these modes of ~~to~~ defining ~~the boundary line~~ it would ~~well~~ involve prolonged & expensive surveys, in connection with which it should be remembered that not more than half the days in the summer season of each year could profitably be employed in mountain work owing to the ~~[illegible]~~ prevalence of mist & thick weather on the Coast.

3 July 1890.

Notes on Phys. features of part of W. Coast in relation to boundary

These notes are on Klotz paper of Dec 1889 and were afterwards published — See Dept. Int. box — Alaska.

Wolle.

Rec'd 14 Feb.

Geo. Cameron.

Kingston
13th Feb. '90.

Dear Dr Dawson,

I have to thank you for your note of yesterday — and to congratulate you on your recovery from the prevailing malady. You have had a long bout of it.

As Professor Dall referred to various authorities — I thought it only prudent to get all that was to be got out of as many of them as I could refer to. Around me are 14 volumes

some of which I have perused nearly throughout and others I have had to take voyages of discovery. This is a consequence of my comparatively short letter of Suffestown to the Minister of the Interior (that you should write Prof: Dall to correct errors in Senate Executive Document No 146), being met with the proposal that I should write a letter to which a reference of the matter to the Foreign Office

should be founded.

I concluded that such a letter would have to be very different from the one I had written to the Minister of the Interior.

If the Foreign Office were to make official remarks to the U.S. about the Ex: Doc: it would be only proper to do so in one of two methods:— to remark on ~~and thus~~ one or two inaccuracies — except all others expressly, and thus bring those remarked

on

on into special prominence,
or, to remark
on all. Under either
circumstances it would
be desirable that they
(Th. 7.0.) should have information
on all, furnished to
them. My task has
thus become much
harder than I had
at first contemplated
— I have now I am
glad to say got through
some pages of fair
copy.

I agree quite ~~with~~
with you in the proviso
that

that should regulate the preparation of the British case: —

'that some definite line of argument and formulation of probably solid contentions should be decided on;— and it is almost certainly with this purpose in view that the Minister has asked Mr Klotz yourself to impart to remarks on the subject.

It must not however be forgotten that it is not less

important

important — to be prepared to meet the case that may be submitted by the U.S.; — and that I regard — indeed — as the most troublesome part by far — not from the possible strength of the adverse position, but from the absence of definite indications of its outline, — and consequently the impossibility of ~~dealing~~ feeling that one has prepared for its exhaustively.

In "Lovell's General Geography with maps & illustrations" published at Montreal in 1863 — there is a map of North America opposite page 14 — on which the

Yonkers

Yonkon River is shown as limited to what I should call the Delta

The main stream from the forks at Fort Yonkon being called by the Indian & Russian name "Kuickpack" for the mouth. Could you find out from the Lovells upon what authority their map is based?

Inasmuch as Mr Klotz disagrees with me about the inlets - I am sure you will be interested in making memᵃ of any arguments or illustrations - not already used - pro or con

that

But you come across.

Yours very truly
D. R. Cameron

Notes on a [illegible]" by Mr O. J. Klotz, "of Message from the President of the United States transmitting report on boundary line between Alaska & British Columbia" (being Ex. Doc. 50th Congress, 2nd Session. Senate Ex. Doc. 146)

Throughout this "Review" it appears to me that Mr Klotz is under the disadvantage of having already, in his report of Dec. 89, committed himself to certain lines of argument. Here he here appears to consider it necessary to defend, though some of them are opposed to propositions which have already (in connection with Conferences in Washington) been decided upon & advanced. While it is possible that some of the views advanced by Mr Klotz may be more correct than those adopted previously, it appears to be evident that unless a decision is arrived at in that sense, such of Mr Klotz' arguments as are opposed to positions already taken, should remain strictly private.

(N.B. In the following letter the paragraphs of Mr Kloß' "Review" are referred to by number as shown in red ink on the margin of the enclosed copy of the "Review")

P.3. This inference is not justified by the facts. It is distinctly stated by me (U.S. Senate Ex. Doc. 146 pp 5, 9) that the Mountain boundary of the Convention is a practicable one, & the Mountain boundary as understood by Canada, is fully outlined in my letter to Sir Charles Tupper of Feb. 7. 1888. (U.S. Senate Ex. Doc. 146 p. 5.) Any detailed discussion of this boundary could, however, have had no result, as Canada & the United States take entirely different views of the interpretation of this part of the Convention & no means have yet been provided for a decision as between these views. The main object of the conferences which Sir Charles Tupper arranged should take place between himself & Mr Dall, was to ascertain whether, without entering into any minute controversy as to the meaning of the Convention, some mutually satisfactory lines could be arrived at, such as to obviate the necessity for such controversy & the possible eventual reference of the text of the Convention to arbitration for its interpretation. (See the first paragraphs of my report on Conferences. U.S. Senate Ex. Doc., 146. p 7) Having, therefore, placed on record the Canadian view of the Mountain boundary as a practicable one to be inverted to if found expedient,

a discussion of other lines was taken up, & though it was found that Mr Doll was not prepared to recommend that basis of settlement which would have been considered most satisfactory to Canada. (See Doc. 200 paragraphs 3) any report on Commissioner's conference & agreement was reached as to the principles by which certain alternative lines might be governed, which may serve as a basis for the further discussion of such lines if such discussion shall be deemed advisable.

P 5. Mr Doll called upon either to admit or deny this statement, for which Mr Bayard is responsible.

P 6-18. The whole of this criticism refers to Mr Doll's letter to Mr Moore, dated Jan. 3. 1888. This letter was handed to me in printed form when I first met Mr Doll, & was apparently intended as a <u>ballon d'essai</u>, written under the presumption that we knew little about the matter in discussion. It was not seriously taken into consideration or backed up by argument, as the reports by Mr Doll & ~~Bayard~~ on our conferences show. It is open to such criticism as that directed against it by Mr Kloty, but under the above circumstances a minute criticism was not considered necessary. The letter addressed by me to Sir Charles Tupper under date Feb. 7. 1888 was thought to be a sufficient general reply, showing as it

does, how completely the Canadian view differs from that of the United States in regard to the interpretation of the language of the Convention of 1825.

P.S. In the cases he quotes from my letter to Mr Charles Sumner of Feb. 9, I adopted the view maintained by General Cameron and rejected the meaning of the expression "to sea". This view was adopted on a mature deliberation of the view of the "history & spirit of the Convention." General Hamilton being distinct from Mr Klotz' arguments yet joins at length in following principles (P 20–28) It is very important to Canada that this view should be upheld if tenable, as it appears to be. It is thus peculiarly important that the force of this claim should not be weakened by any concessions apparently such as those of Mr Klotz.

Of remarks on special points in the paragraphs above referred to, I need only add. (1) P 20–21 Zaire in a position to state from personal observation that land of both the ridges, ranges or crests of mountains or other elevations are more nearly & uniformly parallel to the main ocean coast, than to the "sea-water's edge" including shores of inlets. This however, excludes Lynn Canal, which occupies a longitudinal valley, parallel to the main direction of the Coast Ranges. (2.) The argument advanced is similar to that of Mr Klotz adopted by Bell (U.S. Senate. S. 80 P 25. (2)) but is [illegible]

expressed as fear throughout in the
first time of the Greenland, not of that of
Iceland (1931 [illegible]). The paragraph here quoted
from Sir C. Hoyle's letter shows that it
was intended to secure to Denmark the
"[illegible]" of the trade. This is clearly
[illegible] for to [illegible] that it was intended
to secure to Denmark the inlets which
the Danes found, which may be considered
as such "[illegible]" as upon the
[illegible] of the inland settlers occupied
by the Danes. These inlets are as much
lines as the separating from the mouth
of the Bay, as the same time was
[illegible] of old geographers sometimes
employed for such [illegible] inlets as
[illegible] Coast.

P. 27-32 Further parts may be study & consider
a Country which could be considered fully
within footing of the other; but such may be
of Liberty & that the views hold.
Some considerations which might render
consideration lines, like those opened &
as Nos 1 & 2, advantageous, are given in
my report of Conference with Mr Dall.
Other reasons might be adduced — of these
the principal is, that it appears to be
possible by some such change of base only,
to secure the United States, so far to recede
from their extreme claim as to admit
our claim to the ownership of the upper
parts of the inlets. This claim to the
possession of the heads of the inlets is
really more important to us than

would be very small because in spite of [illegible] it would I think be well to publish the abstract of this claim of the whole thing in any big paper. This is all the more important as so little of the country, and [illegible] of the [illegible] is doubtful. It does not, however, follow that we should from thoroughly [illegible] any history of the adoption of such commercial lines. This depends largely on the retention of the governing point of such lines, which, so far as the distribution has gone, have been left as an open question. This necessarily in consequence of the disagreement of lines as to [illegible] of the country.

P. 34. Nothing is yet definitely known about the country between the St Elias alps, & the country can not therefore be safely characterized as "Sub-arctic wilds". Such slight information as has been gleaned respecting it from Indians, goes to show that it is at least well timbered & a good game country. Her information having as its universal [illegible] is [illegible].

The expense of carrying out the triangulation has opened to [illegible] with the United States, or at least of joining in the work in so far as to check it in Canadian interest, would not be great.

P. 35 – 77. Lord Russell's letter of December (Dec. Russell, No. Dec. 1869 pp. 10 – 22) contains by far the most in the paragraphs which Mr. Dixon calls your first and fifth pamphlets in the Russian Government by the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Why should Lord Russell be carping, disingenuous & hypercritical upon the Anglo-American Commission, he knows the subject thoroughly, knowing his own, & as he is unfortunately prejudiced against the Russians which has been disinfected, it would seem hopeless that he should perceive the great injustice done. This is all the more apparent when it is considered that the Russians have been appealed to by him in a friendly manner & a tone of friendly intercourse which his Lordship has treated contrarily for the first time.

P. 72 – 78. The details of delimitation of the Boundary, in so far as the Alaska Coast-Strip is concerned, naturally depend on the interpretation which may be eventually arrived at respecting the meaning of the wording of the Convention, or on the definition which may be given to some conventional lines. Such fundamental facts having been settled, I should agree with Lord Kleb in believing that no great difficulty need be met with in placing marks in accordance therewith.

P.S. A reference to my previous report on the Yakima Indians shows that after a [illegible] examination you [illegible] had [illegible] to my opinion that his [illegible] is more probable than that [illegible] by his Father. I may mention that in conversation with his Father I ascertained that he had examined the report above referred to at the time he wrote his "Review"

Geo. M. Dawson

Feb. 6. 1890

Indo-Tur Dept
Report & Foreign
re. Immigrants
Feb. 90

Rec'd 3 March.

Kingston Canada
1 Mar: 90.

Dear Dr Dawson,

Your note making a suggestion about a seal close season I sent on at once to Mr Tupper at Washington. His reference to the writer on the habits of the seal may also be useful to him.

About navigating from the Porcupine round the Fork into the Pelly is a point about which we two conversed long ago

and

and I am obliged for your reminder.

If the U.S. maintain that the granting of free navigation does not include a the granting of reasonable facilities to make the navigation practicable — I doubt very much the value to us of such a concession by them. I am thinking of the prohibition to use wood. Is there any chance of oil fuel being developed in the region?

Again the coasting law in the U.S. might at any moment be

put in force to stop the use of the Yukon for us. You may remember that on the Red River while we might reciprocally use the ports in the respective countries — an enterprising Canadian who built a vessel to run South from Winnipeg was stopped at Pembina on the ground that he could not call at two ports in the U.S. in succession: — and, consequently, his business was ruinously destroyed while the U.S. vessels were allowed to continue running. Unless we retain something to be conceded as a quid pro quo

1 March 1890.
Govt Cameron.

quo for all reasonable facilities besides water floatage — we should practically be at the mercy of the U.S.

Moreover — it is apparently an easier matter to ~~show~~ contend that the Pelly & Yukon connected at the Forks than that the separation in name was higher up stream. But I fear the fact is that those who drew up the Washington Treaty article (D.A. Smith advising Sir Stafford Northcote on the subject) had no clear conception of what they were doing — Else how could they stipulate for a reciprocal concession — as regard the U.S — to navigate the Porcupine to and from the sea — the U.S. could not ~~for a very~~

Mar/90 — Land grant by a right to navigate the Porcupine in Portuguese Territory — To & from the sea.
Yours D McLennan

Notes on Alaska Boundary Question
Bancroft, Hist. Alaska

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPARTMENT.
Alfred R. C. Selwyn, C. M. G., LL. D., F. R. S.,
DEPUTY HEAD AND DIRECTOR,
MUSEUM AND OFFICE, SUSSEX STREET, OTTAWA.

189

p. 441. Secret instructions sent to Baranof to push settlements Southward as far as 55th parallel to establish claim to territory etc. (1802) Some account of these given. Stated that the instructions in archives of Russian Am. Co., in State Dept. Washington. This may throw light on the 54° 40' question a boundary. Should see, together with all other archives of the Company.

—

Bancroft quotes truly definition of boundary incorrectly as 'excluding such strip a sound known as Portland Canal' p. 543.

—

See Bancroft's statements as to boundary & particularly as to meaning & possible terminating right to free navigation of rivers crossing the 'coast strip' p. 633.

—

Notes Alaska.
Boundary question
from Bancroft's History
of Alaska.

Sept. 1891

Recd. Oct. 17.

Confidential :

Enc :

Ottawa, 16th Oct., 1894.

Dear Dr. Dawson,

As requested in your note of the 13th, I enclose herewith a copy of your memorandum of the 10th Oct., 1892.

Yours sincerely,

D.M.I:

Geo. M. Dawson, Esq., C.M.G.,
Assistant Director of the
Geological Survey/,
Ottawa.

M.S. Copy. No.

(Confidential) Geological Survey Department,

Ottawa, 10th October, 1892.

Dear Mr. Burgess,

In response to your request for a Memo: of points bearing on the British Columbian contention in regard to Canada-Alaska Boundary, I need not specially note the points already brought forward by the Government of British Columbia, or the fact that a line reaching the coast in the vicinity of Burroughs Bay precisely corresponds with the description of the Treaty of 1825, if the single expression "Portland Canal" be omitted.

Some additional light is afforded by researches made and documents produced in connection with the Behring Sea matter, which depends in great degree on the same Treaty of 1825 and the documents leading up to and bearing on it. We have now got the British-Russian correspondence from 1821 (date of Ukase) in practically complete form, and have added considerably to the papers previously available to General Cameron. We have also positively identified some of the maps referred to on the course of the negotiations, and I hope shortly to be able to trace all of them. These will obviously have a most important bearing on questions of delimitation and should

A. M. Burgess, Esq.,

Deputy Minister of the Interior,

Ottawa.

should all be considered in that connection. We hope further to be able to examine all the correspondence between the Russian-American Company and the Russian Government, before conclusion of Arbitration, and this is likely to throw much incidental light on the intent of the Treaty respecting Boundary, which cannot fail to be of value where the actual wording is obscure.

It appears to me therefore to be important that we should not abandon the B. C. contention till we have exhausted all means of supporting it, and even as it now stands, I think we can make out so colourable a case for this contention as to warrant its being advanced, from a tactical point of view at least.

It seems to me very probable that the confusion as between the assigned northward course of line from southermost point of Prince of Wales Island and the actual eastward course which it would have to follow for a long distance in order to reach Portland Canal, has arisen clerically in the final draft of Treaty, when the accepted parts of the several projets made were being combined.

Again it is still quite possible that before the examination of Russian maps of the time is completed, we may find one upon which the name Portland Inlet is placed otherwise than by Vancouver, and this alone would seem to explain the

whole

whole confusion and to carry the B. C. point.

I may mention the following maps which have so far been found in agreement with the B. C. contention:-

1. Official Russian map of 1802 (1802) showing limit of territory claimed at that date by Russia, and known to have been used in the negotiations as one of the best available maps.

2. Map of North America by H. Brue, Paris, 1815- Semi-official.

3. Map of America, by Wilkinson, London. Published shortly after 1825- showing " Boundary settled, 1825".

4. Map of America by Prof. J. M. F. Schmidt, Berlin, 1830.

5. Map by C. G. Richard. Nurnberg, 1839. (Richard is a well known geographical authority.)

These maps serve to show (1.) What Russia herself claimed, and (2.) That subsequent to the Treaty some Geographers followed the description as now contended for by British Columbia, while most simply took the name "Portland Canal" in laying down the Boundary.

Certified copies of the important parts of these maps should be annexed to any "Case" which may be prepared on the Boundary question, and

when

when I return to London, I propose looking over the collection of maps in the Royal Geo~~logical~~ graphical Society Map Room and elsewhere for further maps bearing on the Behring Sea and Boundary questions.

As further bearing upon the same point, it may be mentioned that in the renewed Charter of the Russian-American Company, dated 1844, the line of Boundary is described in part thus:-

"The above line runs northward (from the southermost point of Prince of Wales Island) along the straits named Portland Channel to that part of the mainland where it touches the 56th Degree of North Latitude".

I may further mention that Vancouver's original journal or log is preserved in the British Museum Library, and though I had not time to examine it last summer, I think that that portion of it which describes Portland Canal and adjacent waters should be transcribed for reference.

A few facts have also turned up which will be of use in showing that the Treaty of 1825 did not contemplate a line of Latitude at 54 degrees, 40 mins. as contended for by the United States, but that that Latitude was mentioned only to denote the initial point. The Latitude line theory, you will remember, is employed by the United States in order to get over the northwardly course assigned

to

to the line, and also as a means of including the Islands to the south of Vancouver's Portland Canal, in Alaska.

Trusting that the above rather sketchy and incomplete notes may be of service.

Believe me,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) George M. Dawson.

10 Oct 1892.

Memo

B.C. Contribution

Alaska Boundary

W. F. King
re B.C. Convention.

Department of the Interior,

TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS BRANCH,

Rec'd. Oct. 14.

Ottawa, 13th Oct 1892

Dear Dr. Dawson,

Mr. Burgess has handed me your letter of the 10th inst, and has asked me to acknowledge it.

You are aware from my conversations with you that I fully agree with you that the line contended for by British Columbia is more consistent with the description in the convention than the Portland Channel line, if only the words "called Portland Channel" can be explained away. Every effort should be made to support this position consistently with our other

contention that Portland Inlet is not Portland Channel.

Certified copies of all these documents, maps, ought certainly to be procured.

Yours sincerely

W. H. King

Ref. 308,168 on 1301/72.
P.C. No. 1462 II - Oct. 1/92.

CCR

J.R.

Great Britian - Alaska Boundary and Passamaquoddy Bay.

Convention

between

The United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britian and Ireland.

For a Joint Survey of the Territory adjacent to the boundary line of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada dividing the territory of Alaska from the Province of British Columbia and the Northwest Territory of Canada.

Concluded at Washington July 22, 1892.

Ratification advised by the Senate July 25, 1892.

Ratified by the President of the United States July 29, 1892.

Ratified by the Queen of Great Britian and Ireland August 5, 1892.

Ratifications exchanged at Washington August 23, 1892.

Proclaimed August 26, 1892.

By the President of the United States of America.

A Proclamation.

Whereas a Convention between the United States of America and Great Britian providing for the delimitation of the existing boundary between the United States and Her Majesty's possessions in North America in respect to such portions of said boundary as may not in fact have

been

been permanently marked in virtue of treaties heretofore concluded, was signed by their respective Phenipotentiaries at the city of Washington, on the 22nd day of July one thousand eight hundred and ninety two, the original of which Convention, being in the English language, is word for word as follows:

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britian and Ireland, being equally desirous to provide for the removal of all possible cause of difference between their respective Governments hereafter in regard to delimitation of the existing boundary between the United States and Her Majesty's possessions in North America in respect to such portions of said boundary as may not in fact have been permanently marked in virtue of treaties heretofore concluded: have resolved to conclude a Convention in furtherance of these ends, and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States, John W. Foster Secretary of State of the United States, and Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britian and Ireland, the Honourable Michael H.Herbert, Charge d'Affaires ad interim of Great Britian.

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed to and concluded the following Articles:

Article 1.

The High Contracting Parties agree that a

coincident

concident or joint survey (as may be found in practice most convenient) shall be made of the territory adjacent to that part of the boundary line of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada dividing the ~~America and the Dominion of Canada~~ territory of Alaska from the Province of British Columbia and the North West Territories of Canada, from the latitude of 54° 40′ North to the point where the said boundary line encounters the 141st degree of longitude westward from the meridian of Greenwich, by Commissions to be appointed severally by the High Contracting parties, with a view to the ascertainment of the facts and data necessary to the permanent delimitation of said boundary line in accordance with the spirit and intent of the existing treaties in regard to it between Great Britian and Russia and between the United States and Russia.

Application will be made without delay to the respective legislative bodies for the appropriations necessary for the prosecution of the survey, and the Commissions to be appointed by the two Governments shall meet at Ottawa within two months after said appropriation shall have been made, and shall proceed as soon as practiable thereafter to the active discharge of their duties.

The respective Commissions shall complete the survey and submit their final reports thereof within two years from the date of their first meeting.

The Commissions shall, so far as they may be able to agree, make a joint report to each of the two

Governments,

Governments, and they shall also report, either jointly or severally, to each Government on any points upon which they may be unable to agree.

Each Government shall pay the expenses of the Commission appointed by it.

Each Government engages to facilitate in every possible way any operations which, in pursuance of the plan to be agreed upon by the Commissions, may be conducted within its territory by the Commission of the other.

The High Contracting parties agree that, as soon as practicable after the report or reports of the Commissions shall have been received, they will proceed to consider and establish the boundary line in question.

Article II.

The High Contracting Parties agree that the Governments of the United States and of Her Britannic Majesty in behalf of the Dominion of Canada shall, with as little delay as possible, appoint two Commissioners, one to be named by each party, to determine upon a method of more accurately marking the boundary line between the two countries in the waters of Passamaquoddy Bay in front of and adjacent to Eastport, in the States of Maine, and to place buoys or fix such other boundary marks as they may determine to be necessary.

Each Government shall pay the expenses of its own Commissioner, and cost of ~~makx~~ marking the boundary in such manner as shall be determined upon shall be

defrayed

J.R.

defrayed by the High Contracting Parties in equal moieties.

Article III.

The present Convention shall be duly ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice of the Senate thereof, and by HerBritannic Majesty; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington within twelve months of the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

In faith whereof we, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this Convention and have hereunto affixed our ~~xxxx~~ seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington the 22nd day of July one thousand eight hundred and ninety two.

(sgd) John W.Foster (Seal)

)"(Michael H.Herbert.(Seal.)

And whereas the said ~~Government~~ Convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington, on the twenty third day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety two:

Now therefore, be it known that I, Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States of America., have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same, and every article and clause thereof, may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and citizens thereof.

In

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this twenty-sixth day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety two and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and seventeenth.

(Seal)

(sgd) Benj. Harrison.

By the President

John W. Foster.

Secretary of State.

26 August 1892.

Ext Convention

Alaska Boundary

&

Passamaquoddy Bay.

Previous to the Conference~~s~~ respecting the Boundary in 1888, a special map was prepared and lithographed in Ottawa for the purposes of this Conference, including new geographical work of 1887. No line of boundary was shown on this lithographed map, but upon a few copies lines were drawn in ink by Dr. Dawson showing (1) A boundary line as given on the U.S. Coast Survey Map of Alaska, 1884. (2) A boundary line approximately following the summits of mountains parallel to Coast, in presumed conformity with the text of the Convention of 1825. (3) One of the Conventional lines discussed during the Conferences and referred to in the printed Correspondence. It was not possible to draw the second conventional line, as this depended upon geographical details not determined at the time.

A note upon the face of the map states that the line from the U.S. Coast Survey Map "disregards both the Treaty reference to mountains and that to the ocean coast."

A copy of the lithographed map, with the lines and notes above referred to, was supplied to Dr. Dall, and is reproduced in facsimilie as Map No. 16 in Senate Ex. Doc. 146 (50th Cong. 2nd Session).

That the line following the Mountains parallel to the Coast must at the time have been accepted as embodying the Canadian view of the Meaning of the Convention, is clearly shown by the addition by the U.S. Authorities, to the facsimilie (at the top and outside the border of the Map) of the words- "Dawson's Canadian Map, 1887, showing conventional lines proposed by Canada."

Ap. 27. 1900

Memo re map lithographed for Bdy. Conference at Washington — sent to J. Pope.

Sewell

Memo. for Pope
Re Watts
Oct. 27. 1900