

CANADA'S GRAB IN ALASKA

What the Dominion Seeks by the Development of an Afterthought.

AMERICA'S CLEARLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS

Boundary Disputed for the First Time in Forty-Two Years—Effect of the Rush to the Klondike Region.

Possessions of two seacoast towns—Dyea and Skagway—in what has been undisputed Alaskan territory for two score years, is the crucial point in the boundary dispute between Canada and the United States, now the subject of diplomatic negotiation.

The boundary line between Alaska and Canada was determined in 1825. At that time the frontiers of Russia and Britain were meeting "on the other side of the world."

Russian fur hunters had pushed eastward across Asia and British fur hunters westward across America, until they had met near the present Alaska-Canada frontier. Accordingly Russia and Britain met by their agents, proceeded to divide up the earth, but a portion thereof, and each strove, as each will, to get a bargain.

A series of proposals and counter-proposals, which in the end is called the "Treaty of 1825," was agreed to last. A formal document was prepared reciting that the king of Great Britain and the emperor of Russia, "being desirous of drawing still closer the ties of good understanding and friendship which may settle among other things the limits of their respective possessions on the northwest coast of America, have named plenipotentiaries," etc., etc.

These full-powered agents described on paper a dividing line, with all the elaborate ceremonial of signing, sealing, delivering, ratifying and exchanging, they mutually accepted on behalf of their governments. The boundary which they described in words was shortly after shown on maps. For sixty years after this agreement no question of boundary was raised, and in 1867 the United States bought from Russia her American possessions and became her successor in title.

Russian America disappeared from the maps and Uncle Sam's big "ice farm in the arctic regions" was established. What the limits of this farm were made a question in congress when the proposed purchase was under discussion. This gave an opportunity for explanation that one point in favor of this purchase was a clear title. As the boundary had already been established by the treaty of 1825, it was mutually and formally agreed upon and had never thereafter been questioned, the advocates of purchase might well believe the title to be beyond possible dispute.

It is of the highest importance that this boundary matter be adjusted promptly, justly and amicably. An undetermined frontier is a perpetual menace. It is the policy of the United States to make generous concessions, but that the United States will concede nothing. It is also given out with apparently equal authority that the United States are willing to concede much, but the Canadian side will concede nothing.

There are some matters as to which it cannot be doubted that an agreement has been reached, others as to which it is certain there is disagreement. What are these? Does Canada wish territory on the shores of Lynn canal that she may have a Klondike outlet? Quite naturally.

But what has this to do with the treaty of 1825? Is a boundary to be shifted or a treaty interpreted according to one's wishes or supposed interests? Shall the United States set up a speculative claim to the St. Lawrence because some administration might fancy such possession to be useful to the United States? Such claims would surely be resented as insincere and unfriendly. And can it be denied that there is a unanimous feeling among the United States students of the Alaskan boundary that Canada's course has been unreasonable, some say contemptuous. It seems to me the negotiations should be made public, lest in the darkness of secrecy injustice be done to Canada or to the United States.

With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article, it is understood that the Prince of Wales island shall belong wholly to Russia (now, by this session, to the United States).

That whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direct line north to the coast from the 56th degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude shall prove to be at the distance of more than ten marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between the British possessions and the line of the coast which is to belong to Russia as above mentioned (that is to say, the limit to the possessions ceded by this convention) shall be formed by a line parallel to the winding of the coast, and which shall sever the distance of ten marine leagues therefrom.

The Reshadde Reaton. To make this clear reference may be made to the accompanying diagram, where the line beginning at the southernmost point of Prince of Wales island is carried eastward to the mouth of Portland canal, up which it ascends to the head thereof, and thence runs parallel to the coast, crossing the continental coast line and ten marine leagues (equal to about thirty-five miles) from it until it intersects the 141st meridian from Greenwich in the vicinity of Mount St. Elias, Northward from Mount St. Elias is only a matter of miles, and the astronomer to locate the 141st meridian, as to this there is said to be agreement. Southeast from St. Elias, however, is the post-handle region, a rugged, icebound strip, indented with long fjords or inlets filled with deep water. In front of the coast is a great archipelago, which after the Russian czar was named Alexander. It contains more than 1,000 islands, small and great, and several towns, such as Sitka, Wrangell and others.

What the respective claims of Canada and the United States are as to the boundary is not made public. I shall assume that those of the United States are as indicated on the accompanying sketch. This means that the United States claims a strip upon the "coast of the continent" thirty-five miles wide, the western edge of the strip being the continental coast line and the eastern edge a line "parallel to the winding of the coast." What the Canadian claim may be is less easily described. Beginning with 1854 several lines have appeared on Canadian maps, and then, no longer carried, but as a line as required by the treaty, but up Behm canal, and, continuing, passed around the head of Lynn canal. A little later another Canadian map appeared, on which the line was similarly carried up Behm canal and then, no longer carried, but as a line as required by the treaty, but up Behm canal, and, continuing, passed around the head of Lynn canal.

When this boundary treaty of 1825 was under discussion and each government was striving to secure as favorable terms as possible for the companies interested, Count Nesselrode, speaking for Russia, said: "Thus we wish to keep and the English companies wish to obtain." The newspapers ever that this language still applies, and even with increased force. Only those who are outside know if the newspapers are right, but the long negotiation and so far fruitless outcome give color to this view.

Settlement Urged. It is of the highest importance that this boundary matter be adjusted promptly, justly and amicably. An undetermined frontier is a perpetual menace. It is the policy of the United States to make generous concessions, but that the United States will concede nothing. It is also given out with apparently equal authority that the United States are willing to concede much, but the Canadian side will concede nothing.

There are some matters as to which it cannot be doubted that an agreement has been reached, others as to which it is certain there is disagreement. What are these? Does Canada wish territory on the shores of Lynn canal that she may have a Klondike outlet? Quite naturally.

But what has this to do with the treaty of 1825? Is a boundary to be shifted or a treaty interpreted according to one's wishes or supposed interests? Shall the United States set up a speculative claim to the St. Lawrence because some administration might fancy such possession to be useful to the United States? Such claims would surely be resented as insincere and unfriendly. And can it be denied that there is a unanimous feeling among the United States students of the Alaskan boundary that Canada's course has been unreasonable, some say contemptuous. It seems to me the negotiations should be made public, lest in the darkness of secrecy injustice be done to Canada or to the United States.

When a new star floats into the field of vision of some watchful astronomer, the world honors the discoverer, gives the new star a fitting name, and records the addition to the sun's family of human knowledge gained by this discovery.

Yet of what small profit to humanity at large is this discovery? What will those cold star rays do for the sleepless sufferer who coughs and burns the long night through? A far greater discovery for the sick is Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery, a remedy which has cured thousands of such sufferers. Obsolete and deep-seated coughs, bronchitis, whooping and bleeding lungs and other conditions, which, if neglected, lead to consumption, are permanently cured by "Golden Medical Discovery." It contains no alcohol or other intoxicant, neither opium, cocaine nor other narcotic.

"I had a terrible cough something over a year ago and could not stop it, or even to get a little relief," writes J. M. Ferris, of Canton, Ohio. "I was so badly afflicted that I was almost dead. I bought a bottle of your valuable Golden Medical Discovery. Before I had taken half a bottle I was well."

WAS KILLING ACCIDENTAL?

Attorneys Argue that Chollman Did Not Mean to Kill Jones.

STATE FAILS TO SHOW MALICE OR INTENT

On This Showing the Jury is Asked to Acquit the Defendant on the Evidence in the Prosecution.

The Chollman murder case went to the jury at noon yesterday. The forenoon was occupied by the arguments of counsel for the defense, and the afternoon by the prosecution.

The attorneys for the defense based their arguments on the theory that the killing of Jones was an accident and not a murder. They referred earnestly to the fact that Chollman had no motive, and that he had no means of committing the crime. They also pointed out that Chollman had no previous record, and that he was a man of good character.

The state failed to show malice or intent on the part of Chollman. The evidence showed that Chollman was in the vicinity of the crime at the time it was committed, but that he had no motive for killing Jones.

The jury was asked to acquit Chollman on the evidence in the prosecution. The attorneys for the defense argued that the state had failed to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

The jury returned its verdict at 1:30 p.m. It found Chollman not guilty of the murder of Jones. The state's attorneys expressed their disappointment at the verdict.

The Chollman murder case was one of the most interesting trials of the season. It attracted a large crowd of spectators to the courtroom.

The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought. They pointed out that Chollman had a grudge against Jones, and that he had planned the crime.

The defense attorneys argued that Chollman had no motive for killing Jones. They pointed out that Chollman and Jones were friends, and that Chollman had no reason to hate Jones.

The jury believed the defense's arguments. They found Chollman not guilty. The state's attorneys had failed to prove their case.

The Chollman murder case was a close one. The state's attorneys had a strong case, but the defense's arguments were equally strong.

The jury's verdict was a surprise to many. They had expected Chollman to be found guilty. The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought.

The Chollman murder case was one of the most interesting trials of the season. It attracted a large crowd of spectators to the courtroom.

The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought. They pointed out that Chollman had a grudge against Jones, and that he had planned the crime.

The defense attorneys argued that Chollman had no motive for killing Jones. They pointed out that Chollman and Jones were friends, and that Chollman had no reason to hate Jones.

The jury believed the defense's arguments. They found Chollman not guilty. The state's attorneys had failed to prove their case.

The Chollman murder case was a close one. The state's attorneys had a strong case, but the defense's arguments were equally strong.

The jury's verdict was a surprise to many. They had expected Chollman to be found guilty. The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought.

The Chollman murder case was one of the most interesting trials of the season. It attracted a large crowd of spectators to the courtroom.

The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought. They pointed out that Chollman had a grudge against Jones, and that he had planned the crime.

The defense attorneys argued that Chollman had no motive for killing Jones. They pointed out that Chollman and Jones were friends, and that Chollman had no reason to hate Jones.

The jury believed the defense's arguments. They found Chollman not guilty. The state's attorneys had failed to prove their case.

The Chollman murder case was a close one. The state's attorneys had a strong case, but the defense's arguments were equally strong.

The jury's verdict was a surprise to many. They had expected Chollman to be found guilty. The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought.

The Chollman murder case was one of the most interesting trials of the season. It attracted a large crowd of spectators to the courtroom.

The state's attorneys had argued that Chollman had killed Jones with malice aforethought. They pointed out that Chollman had a grudge against Jones, and that he had planned the crime.

NEBRASKANS COMING HOME

Committees Figure on Bringing the First Nebraska Regiment to Omaha.

GOES AFTER MUTUAL INSURANCE.

Attorney General Brings Proceedings Against Grain Growers.

Acting in behalf of the state, Attorney General Smyth has filed quo warranto proceedings in the district court of this county to compel the Grain Growers' Mutual Hall to issue a license to the grain elevators to continue in business.

The defendants are P. W. Miller, C. M. Harris, C. C. White, John Traulich and F. H. Hilliker. The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

The Grain Growers' Mutual Hall is a corporation organized in 1887. It has a capital of \$100,000 and a surplus of \$50,000. It has a large membership and a large business.

The attorney general contends that the company was never legally incorporated as required by the laws of the state. He contends that the company is an illegal corporation and that its business is illegal.

PAINTINGS ARE ON THE WAY

Owners of Works of Art Advise President Miller of the Exhibition.

FLOOD VICTIM SEES FOR DAMAGE.

Another Case Against the City on Account of Bad Drainage.

Emilia Werner is the occupant of a small dwelling at 4719 Hamilton street and because the property was flooded with surface water during the heavy rains of 1898 she has sued the city of Omaha for \$2,500 damages.

The plaintiff declares that during the heavy rain of May 20, 1898, the culvert was totally inadequate and the water backed up until it was three feet deep in the dwelling. The furniture was ruined, the garden destroyed and a brood of chickens drowned.

On July 6 another storm occurred and the damage was even greater, and after several efforts to effect a settlement with the city officials the victim has gone into court for relief.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

CADET BATTALION OFFICERS

Announcements of the High School Military Organization Made Yesterday.

PAINTINGS ARE ON THE WAY

Owners of Works of Art Advise President Miller of the Exhibition.

Emilia Werner is the occupant of a small dwelling at 4719 Hamilton street and because the property was flooded with surface water during the heavy rains of 1898 she has sued the city of Omaha for \$2,500 damages.

The plaintiff declares that during the heavy rain of May 20, 1898, the culvert was totally inadequate and the water backed up until it was three feet deep in the dwelling. The furniture was ruined, the garden destroyed and a brood of chickens drowned.

On July 6 another storm occurred and the damage was even greater, and after several efforts to effect a settlement with the city officials the victim has gone into court for relief.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

PAINTINGS ARE ON THE WAY

Owners of Works of Art Advise President Miller of the Exhibition.

FLOOD VICTIM SEES FOR DAMAGE.

Another Case Against the City on Account of Bad Drainage.

Emilia Werner is the occupant of a small dwelling at 4719 Hamilton street and because the property was flooded with surface water during the heavy rains of 1898 she has sued the city of Omaha for \$2,500 damages.

The plaintiff declares that during the heavy rain of May 20, 1898, the culvert was totally inadequate and the water backed up until it was three feet deep in the dwelling. The furniture was ruined, the garden destroyed and a brood of chickens drowned.

On July 6 another storm occurred and the damage was even greater, and after several efforts to effect a settlement with the city officials the victim has gone into court for relief.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.

The case will be heard by the court at a later date. The plaintiff's attorney is J. H. Miller.

The city officials contend that the culvert was adequate and that the damage was caused by the heavy rain. They contend that the plaintiff's damages are excessive.