

southern terminus, to Mount St. Elias, the northern end of the 'panhandle,' the boundary to follow the configuration of the coast, and not to be drawn from headland to headland. About 20,700 square miles of territory instead of a small fraction of that area. Continued control of the many important bays and inlets throughout the 600 miles of coast from Mount St. Elias to Portland canal. Much valuable mineral land, and the fisheries along the coast. Supremacy in the Northern Pacific ocean."

AN INTERESTING RESUME OF THE ALASKAN commission's verdict is presented by the London correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald. This correspondent points out that the Alaskan boundary commission has recognized American ownership of the entire Alaska "panhandle" which at various times since 1867 has caused serious friction between the United States and Canada. Assuming that the commission's judgment will be affirmed by the two governments, and there seems to be no question on this point, this verdict means that Great Britain admits the right of the United States to about 20,700 square miles of territory instead of the small fraction thereof, together with continued control of many important bays and inlets through the 600 miles of sea coast. It means also American supremacy in the Northern Pacific and American possession of much valuable mineral land that Canada has for years claimed.

THE PORTLAND CANAL, AS IS POINTED out by this London correspondent, is at the southernmost end of this strip of territory and the American boundary line is merely shifted from the southern to the northern side of the channel. A Canadian factory and a small settlement of Canadians is at its head and the American commissioners seeing that Lord Alverstone was disposed to grant the justice of their contentions on every other point, agreed to allow Canada to have the Portland canal. During the discussions before the commission, it was pointed out by the American counsel that the British claims as recently presented were not seriously made until late in the '70's when gold was discovered in the disputed territory. In fact, as is pointed out by the Record-Herald's correspondent, most of the evidence against Canada was from the utterances of prominent Canadians and Englishmen. It was shown that from the time of the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825 until long after Alaska's transfer to the United States in 1867, official Canada did not contest the boundary lines laid down by Russia and in truth recognized the American claim.

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE UNITED States and Great Britain concerning the Alaskan boundary has existed for many years. As is pointed out by the Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald, the main question was whether the boundary ran across the numerous inlets and arms of the sea in the territory, or whether it ran round them. Canada contended that the line cut across the inlets, leaving the United States nothing but a waste tract of rocky, isolated promontories. The controversy centered on Canada's effort to acquire an outlet to the sea, the assertion being that the Russo-British treaty of 1825 fixed the boundary line in her favor. Canada also said all inlets less than six miles wide in the disputed territory belonged to her. The Portland canal, or channel, is important to Canada chiefly because it grants that country the desired exit to the sea. It is at the southernmost end of the "panhandle," where there is a factory and a Canadian settlement. The boundary line is simply moved across the channel. At its mouth it is divided into two channels by Pearse island, which is a tiny piece of land of no particular value. The eastern channel has all along been conceded to Canada, which now merely obtains the undisputed possession of the other water way or western channel.

THAT THE BOUNDARY LINE AS ESTABLISHED in the treaty of 1825 gave Russia control of the canal by recognizing her sovereignty over a strip of land which included the territory surrounding and behind the canal for some miles was the contention of the United States. It therefore held that when Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867, the title reverted in full to the United States. England contended that by negotiations with Russia between the years 1825 and 1835, the sovereignty held by Russia was invalidated, but the question was never given serious consideration until 1896, after the discovery of gold in the Klondike. The United States is conceded control of the Lynn canal, possession of

which was chiefly desired by England because of the rich mining towns of Dyea, the port of entry; Skagway, White Pass and Lake Bennett, situated along its banks and within easy access of the sea. It is in and about this section that the rich gold deposits are located and by their indisputable acquisition this country has gained an important victory. Strong opposition was made to the claim of the United States for this long and valuable strip of territory on which Canada has for the last seven years cast envious eyes and which England desired above all else.

IN JANUARY, 1903, REPRESENTATIVES OF the two governments entered into an agreement whereby the question with respect to the Alaskan boundary should be submitted to arbitration. The points at issue were to be decided by the majority report. Senators Lodge and Turner, Secretary of War Root, and Messrs. John W. Foster, J. M. Dickinson and Daniel L. Watson were chosen to represent the United States. Lord Alverstone, Sir Louis A. Jette, Allen B. Aylesworth, and Clifford Sifton, Sir Robert Finlay, and Christopher Robinson were chosen to represent Canada. The representatives of the United States pointed out that for more than fifty years England had not contested the interpretation proclaimed by both Russia and the United States that the boundary of the Alaskan "panhandle" cut off Canada from access to the sea "about the point of 44 degrees, 40 minutes." It was further pointed out that it was not until 1898 that England claimed that the right interpretation of the treaty gave Canada the upper portion of virtually all the fords between Portland canal and Mount St. Elias.

AT ONE TIME THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN the two governments with respect to the Alaskan boundary reached an acute stage. It will be remembered that serious trouble between the inhabitants of the disputed territory was with great difficulty averted. At one time the United States was required to send troops to Dyea and Skagway and Canada assigned mounted police to both places. Finally in 1900 a modus vivendi was agreed to whereby a temporary boundary was described. It seems to be taken for granted that a distinguished member of the British commission having agreed to the claims set forth by the United States government, there will be little or no difficulty as to the proposition that both governments confirm the verdict.

THE AUTOMOBILE SEEMS TO BE ESTABLISHING a record for man-killing. A writer in the Kansas City Journal shows that for the year ending August 30, 1903, automobiles have killed as many persons in England in a week as the railroads did in a year. It is pointed out that the accidents enumerated in England and Wales during the period mentioned were 3,991, the persons injured being 2,991 and the deaths 411. The figures show an average of 76.75 accidents per week, with 57.52 persons injured and 7.9 killed every week. During the last twelve months the total number of passengers and railway officials killed by accidents to passenger trains on British railways was eight, the injured being 224.

AN IMPORTANT DECISION WAS DELIVERED by the New York court of appeals on October 13. The case was entitled "The People vs. Pierson." The Albany correspondent for the Philadelphia Public Ledger says: "Pierson lives at White Plains, and early in 1901 was sentenced to 500 days' imprisonment or fined \$500 for criminal neglect in failing to provide a licensed physician to attend his sixteen-months-old adopted daughter in a case of bronchial pneumonia, which afterward proved fatal. Pierson and his wife belong to the 'Christian Catholic church,' of which John Alexander Dowie is the 'general overseer,' and a cardinal principle of their faith is the avoidance of drugs. The conviction was secured under the penal code, which holds that 'a person who omits without lawful excuse to perform a duty by law imposed upon him, to furnish food, clothing, shelter or medical attendance to a minor, is guilty,' etc."

IN THE CASE OF THE PEOPLE VS. PIERSON, Justice Bartlett, who wrote the prevailing opinion in the appellate division, held that the "medical attendance" referred to in the statute did not mean exclusively the attendance of a medical practitioner in the general sense of the term, and in the appellate division the conviction was reversed. But Judge Haight, writing the prevailing opinion for the New York court of appeals, said: "It would seem that the legislative intent is rea-

sonably clear, although possibly more precise language could have been employed. The section of the code under which the indictment was found contemplates that there are persons upon whom the law casts a duty of caring for minors. We are aware that there are people who believe that the divine power may be invoked to heal the sick, and that faith is all that is required. There are others who believe that the Creator has supplied the earth, nature's storehouse, with everything that man may want for his support and maintenance, including the restoration and preservation of his health, and that he is left to work out his own salvation under fixed natural laws. There are still others who believe that Christianity and science go hand in hand, both proceeding from the Creator; that science is but the agent of the Almighty, through which He accomplishes results, and that both science and divine power may be invoked together to restore diseased and suffering humanity. But, titting as a court of law for the purpose of construing and determining the meaning of statutes, we have nothing to do with variances in religious belief, and have no power to determine which is correct. We place no limitations upon the power of the mind over the body, the power of faith to dispel disease, or the power of the Supreme Being to heal the sick. We merely declare the law as given us by the legislature. We find no error on the part of the trial court that called for a reversal."

GENERAL FUNSTON, IN COMMAND OF THE department of the Columbia, in his annual report made public recently at the war department, says something that will be of considerable interest to enlisted men. General Funston says: "To get and keep a good class of men there must be a radical increase in the pay of the rank and file. There is no disguising the fact that recruits are obtained with difficulty, and that most of them are not satisfactory. Few men re-enlist, while the number of desertions and dishonorable discharges is phenomenal. The government cannot get something for nothing. The pay of the enlisted men of the army is ridiculously small. The wonder is, not that so few men enlist and that so small a percentage of them re-enlist after three years, but that we obtain and keep so many really good men as we do. In many parts of the United States ignorant, unskilled laborers, working by the day, are able to save above their board and clothing twice the amount received by a private soldier on his second enlistment, and yet only a small percentage of these men could pass the test in a recruiting office. If the pay of a private on his first enlistment were made to approach that of a farm laborer, I am of the opinion that there would be a sufficient number of enlistments of a very superior class—young men from the farms, who are usually of good physique and have a common school education, and are not so much addicted to intemperate habits as men recruited in the cities."

IT HAS BECOME APPARENT THROUGHOUT England that the English race is losing in physical vigor and this state of affairs has led the government to appoint a commission to inquire into the matter. The clerk of the privy council is the chairman of this commission and he is to be assisted by the former head of the army gymnastic school, the inspector of reformatories, the chief of the navy recruiting service, statisticians and others. The London correspondent of the New York Herald, under date of London, September 5, says: "The appointment of the commission was the outcome of a debate in the house of lords, July 16, during which Lord Meath and the Bishop of Ripon drew attention to the terrible conditions prevailing among the poorer classes. The Duke of Devonshire, lord president of the council, then admitted that Great Britain's military and industrial outlook was seriously threatened and promised an inquiry into the matter. The subject was also brought up in the house of commons by Sir William R. Anson, parliamentary secretary to the board of education, who declared 60,000 children now attending London schools were physically unfit for instruction. The director general of the army medical service reports that one man in every three offered as recruits had to be rejected. The appointment of the commission is hailed with approval. The Daily Chronicle says: 'If the people as a whole are deteriorating we must change our ways or give up the national struggle as a mistake. The creation and preservation of a fine stock of mankind is the first, perhaps the only, reason for national existence, and if the mass of the people are going downhill in physique we may be quite sure it is going downhill in character and intellect as well.'