

50. In April 1929 Sir E. Howard reported that the United States press was displaying considerable excitement over a note which the State Department was believed to be about to despatch in reply to the British note of the 17th November, 1928, which was described as amounting to a British claim to hegemony over the whole Antarctic. According to the press the United States Government intended to claim that all Wilkes Land is American by discovery and to make a counter claim respecting the Falkland Islands Dependencies, in which area lies Graham Land, which was first discovered by Captain Palmer, of the United States Navy, in 1820. The State Department was also said to be contemplating suggesting exchanging the British claim to Wilkes Land for the American claim in the Falkland Islands Dependencies. Sir E. Howard said that he proposed to make no communication to the United States Government until he received the threatened note from the State Department.

51. The note was never received, and reports from Washington justified the inference that there were two parties in the State Department, the first in favour of pushing American claims and the second advocating a more prudent policy. From what has since occurred it appears that the second party is in the ascendant for the moment. In this connexion it is of interest to mention that, so recently as 1924, the United States evinced so little interest in making claims in the Antarctic that Mr. Hughes, the Secretary of State, speaking of Wilkes Land, said: "In the absence of an act of Congress assertive of dominion over Wilkes Land, this department would be reluctant to declare that the United States possessed a right of sovereignty over that territory."

52. On the 15th November, 1929, the State Department addressed a note to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Washington expressing regret that, through an oversight, no reply had been made to the British note of the 17th November, 1928, and conveying the appreciation of the United States Government of the interest of His Majesty's Government in Admiral Byrd's expedition. The note went on to say:—

"The reference in the Ambassador's note to the Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1926 containing an account of discussions concerning certain regions of the Antarctic has been noted, but since it is assumed that this was merely brought to the Department's attention for its information, no comment by the Department would seem to be called for at this time."

53. The substance of the British note of the 17th November, 1928, and of the United States reply, was given to the United States press. The latter generally took the line that the reply of the State Department, whilst deferring the possibility of any controversy, was designed to leave the door open for further discussions. These, it was thought, would be initiated sooner or later in view of possible United States claims to Wilkes and Graham Lands and to the territories discovered by Admiral Byrd. The question of the possible application of the Monroe doctrine was also stated to be receiving consideration at the State Department.

54. Meanwhile, news was received from Washington of the great public interest aroused by the reports of Admiral Byrd's successful flight to the South Pole. A suitable message of congratulation was sent to the United States Government by the Secretary of State for Air. The fact that the American flag had been hoisted in the Antarctic over "Little America," as the base in the Ross Sea was called, and that American names, such as "Rockefeller" and "Charles Bob" Mountains and "Marie Byrd Land," had been placed on the map, and that the South Pole had been flown over for the first time in the course of Admiral Byrd's seventeen hours' flight on the 28th November, 1929, led a considerable part of the American public to regard these territories as theirs. On the 1st July, 1930, Senator Tydings of Maryland introduced in the Senate the following resolution, which attracted a great deal of publicity:—

"Whereas certain hitherto unknown areas of land in the South Polar region have been discovered and explored by Rear-Admiral Richard E. Byrd;

"Whereas the British Government has notified the Department of State that various areas in the Antarctic, which comprise almost the entire South Polar cap, are claimed as British territory;

"Whereas the regions claimed by Great Britain include two areas originally discovered by American naval officers as early as 1820 and 1840;

Commonwealth Government. The areas in question are those mentioned in the Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1926, with the exception of the first, which it was contemplated would eventually be included within the Falkland Islands Dependencies. It was thought, however, that to issue letters patent claiming sovereign rights in these areas might only have the effect of drawing the attention of the Government of the United States to them, and might cause that Government to think that the letters had been issued for the express purpose of preventing the expedition from laying claim to any hitherto undiscovered territory. It has been necessary, therefore, to inform the Commonwealth Government that the present moment is not altogether opportune for the issue of letters patent.

"Though there are no grounds on which His Majesty's Governments concerned could object to this proposed aerial expedition to the South Pole, it nevertheless appears advisable to bring the rights and interests of those Governments in the areas which may be explored to the notice of the United States Government, in order to avoid any difficulties which might subsequently arise out of a claim made by the United States Government to the possession of any hitherto undiscovered land lying within the area which the Imperial Conference recommended should be brought ultimately under British sovereignty. Perhaps the most tactful method of doing this will be to make an offer to afford any desired help to the expedition while it is in the Ross Dependency and in the Falkland Islands Dependencies. For your own information, I would explain that no similar offer can be made in respect of the areas described in the preceding paragraph, since in their case, unlike those of the two dependencies just mentioned, which were annexed respectively by an Order in Council dated the 30th July, 1923, and by letters patent dated the 21st July, and modified on the 23rd March, 1917, no formal action by way of annexation has been taken. Notwithstanding that fact, it appears desirable, as already stated, to bring British rights and interests in those areas to the notice of the United States Government, as was done in the case of the Government of Norway in connexion with a recent Norwegian expedition."

48. On the 3rd October His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Washington enquired by telegraph whether it was desired that British interests in the sector between the Ross Sea and the Falkland Islands Dependencies should be brought to the notice of the United States Government as well as the sector in which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia were interested. He was informed, in reply, that Sir H. Wilkins had been authorised to assert British interests in the former sector by taking formal possession in the name of His Majesty of any land which he might discover. In view of this and of a report from New Zealand to the effect that Admiral Byrd had publicly stated that his intentions were purely scientific, it seemed clearly desirable to make to the United States Government no further communication of a nature which might incite them to give instructions to Admiral Byrd to assert United States rights, a proceeding which they had apparently hitherto not contemplated. His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington accordingly addressed a note to the State Department on the 17th November, 1928, in the sense originally proposed, viz., merely calling their attention to the areas specified in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings, and offering Admiral Byrd the assistance of the authorities in the Ross Dependency and the Falkland Islands Dependencies.

49. In February 1929 the New York "Times" published a message from the Byrd expedition reporting that Admiral Byrd had discovered and claimed for the United States new territory between the Ross Sea and Graham Land and outside the limits of the Ross Sea Dependency. Although it was not known here whether Admiral Byrd had official authority to claim territory on behalf of the United States, there appeared no ground for supposing that the limits of the Ross Sea Dependency had not been respected, and there was, therefore, no reason to contest Admiral Byrd's claim as reported at the time. On the other hand, Sir E. Shackleton had taken possession of the Central Polar Plateau on behalf of His Majesty in 1909, and it was possible that Admiral Byrd's claims might impinge on the plateau and so overlap territory which is considered to be British. It was therefore considered desirable to instruct His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington to acquaint the United States Government with the facts, in the event of their raising the matter.

(7.) *The United States and the South Orkneys.*

45. In 1831, and again in 1854, the United States asserted their claim to certain fishing rights in these regions. It is unnecessary to go into the history of this old dispute at any length, but the upshot of the correspondence may be summarised as follows:—

(a.) *Fishery Rights.*—The British Government did not admit the United States claim, but they did not press the matter, believing it advisable to enforce the exclusive rights of the British Crown gradually.

(b.) *Sovereignty.*—Since the reoccupation of the islands by Great Britain in 1833, the United States have declined to become a party to the controversy between Great Britain and the Argentine. The United States have claimed no sovereign rights for themselves nor conceded any to any other Power. Nevertheless, in 1911, a United States citizen applied to His Majesty's Government, through the United States Embassy in London, for a licence to seal in the islands, and this fact seems to imply a *de facto* recognition of British rights.

(c.) *Monroe Doctrine.*—The United States Government have refused to apply the Monroe doctrine, invoked by the Argentine Government, to the action of Great Britain in asserting sovereign rights over the islands.

(8.) *Admiral Byrd's Expedition.*

46. In April 1928 His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington reported that Admiral Byrd, the well-known American aviator, was planning an expedition in the following autumn, which would attempt to reach the South Pole by aeroplane. Sir E. Howard added that there was no indication that the expedition was otherwise than of a purely scientific character. The intention was to sail for the Ross Sea barrier and to spend from three to fifteen months in the Antarctic laying down bases towards the South Pole and doing exploration work, probably east of the ice barrier and King Edward VII Land.

47. Later reports in the United States press indicated that the Byrd expedition might lay claim to territories which they discovered. In view of the fact that Sir E. Howard's report showed that most of the exploration work would be done in areas specified in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings, it was decided to call the attention of the United States Government to the existence of the British claims in the areas in question in much the same way as was done in the case of the expedition of the "Norvegia" (see paragraph 18). A despatch was accordingly addressed on the 4th September, 1928, to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington instructing him to call the attention of the United States Government to the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings, and to state that, if the United States Government so desired, instructions would be issued to the appropriate authorities to afford Admiral Byrd every assistance in their power while the expedition was in the Ross Dependency and the Falkland Islands Dependencies. The despatch contained the following explanatory statement for the information of the Ambassador:—

"The report of the Committee of the Imperial Conference of 1926, which considered the question of British policy in the Antarctic, contains certain recommendations for (i) the extension of the Ross and Falkland Islands Dependencies eastward and westward respectively in such a manner as ultimately to include the whole section lying between the eastern boundary of the Ross Dependency and the western boundary of the Falkland Islands Dependencies; and (ii) the annexation of certain areas lying between the western boundary of the Ross Dependency and the eastern boundary of the Falkland Islands Dependencies. The report advised that this should be done first by despatching expeditions to these areas, and subsequently by issuing letters patent in respect of them.

"While it has so far not been found possible to carry out these recommendations, His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia have lately proposed that, notwithstanding the failure hitherto to despatch an expedition, letters patent should be issued annexing certain areas in the Antarctic (which happen to be within the areas which may be explored by the Byrd expedition) and placing them under the administration of the

43. In the meantime, the Argentine Government had maintained the meteorological station, and in 1925 they added a wireless station to their observatory. His Majesty's Ambassador at Buenos Aires was instructed to inform the Argentine Government that they should make application for a licence and call-signal from the Governor of the Falkland Islands, and that a call-signal from the list of groups reserved for members of the British Empire would be allotted to them. In reply, the Argentine Government merely stated that, with regard to wireless stations constructed in Argentine territory, they would act in accordance with the provision of the International Radio-Telegraphic Convention, of which they were signatories. Sir Malcolm Robertson accordingly informed the Argentine Government, on the 14th April, 1926, that, while the precise meaning of their note was not clear, it was not interpreted by His Majesty's Government as an assertion of sovereignty over the islands, which were undoubtedly British on the grounds of discovery and formal taking of possession, and to which no Argentine Government appeared ever to have put forward a claim in any communication to His Majesty's Government. No answer was returned to this note.

44. In 1927 the wireless station began to work without having previously obtained a British licence or call-signal. Sir M. Robertson accordingly drew the attention of the Argentine Government once again, on the 8th September, 1927, to his previous note of the 14th April, 1926, and stated that His Majesty's Government, having heard nothing further on the subject from the Argentine Government, had assumed that their view was shared by the Argentine Government. The attitude of the Argentine Government implied an assumption of Argentine sovereignty over the islands—an assumption which, as the Argentine Government would readily understand, His Majesty's Government could not admit. In these circumstances he had to point out that the present position as regards the wireless station was quite irregular, and to express the hope that the matter might be placed on a proper footing at an early date by an application for a British licence. To this the Argentine Government replied that they could not admit the British position, and that they themselves laid claim to the South Orkneys, apart from other inalienable rights, on the ground of first effective occupation constantly maintained. This note was accompanied by an official memorandum from the Argentine Government suggesting that the negotiations for the exchange of the islands against a Legation site in Buenos Aires should be reopened. Sir M. Robertson urged that the negotiations for the exchange of the islands against a Legation site should be reopened in accordance with the Argentine suggestion. This project was rejected on the grounds: (1) That the whaling industry in the South Orkneys is valuable and ought not to be relinquished, and that, if these islands passed into other hands, they would serve as a base for competitive whalers whose operations would seriously affect the large and profitable whaling industry in the Falkland Islands Dependencies; (2) that any sign of weakness on our part in the South Orkneys would adversely affect our position in the Falkland Islands. The idea of an exchange was accordingly dropped, and it was decided to make no reply to the Argentine Government. Since that date the question has not been broached by either party.

(Explanatory Note.)—Continued from previous page.

Unless Sir R. Tower withheld such a vital piece of information, which is hardly imaginable, no objection of this sort was raised at all. A draft convention was submitted by Sir R. Tower, in which the word "cession" was used. The Argentine Government replied with a counter-draft in which they made use, without any comment, of the expression: "S.M. Británica dá por incorporadas al domino argentino las Islas Orcadas." An amended draft was handed to Dr. Bosch by Sir R. Tower on the 10th January, 1914, and almost immediately afterwards there was a change of Government. In March 1914, in the absence of any reply to his note of the 10th January, His Majesty's Minister asked the new Foreign Secretary whether he might expect an expression of the views of the Argentine Government in this matter. He was informed in reply that "Dr. Plaza (Acting President) had given his opinion that the present was an inauspicious moment to put forward any suggestion entailing expenditure by the Argentine Government, and that he felt that the contemplated purchase of a site for a British Legation in Buenos Aires would prove onerous at a moment when every endeavour was being made towards effecting economies in all the Departments of State." The Foreign Secretary acquiesced, then, in Sir R. Tower's suggestion that perhaps, in the circumstances, it would be preferable to drop the question altogether.

The final paragraph of Sir R. Tower's despatch reporting the above conversation does not support the suggestion made by the Argentine Government in 1928. He says: "Both President Peña and Dr. Bosch were, I believe, genuinely desirous of giving effect to the exchange of courtesies with His Majesty's Government. That generation has passed away and the present Administration shows no favour to anything which will entail expense."

(6.) *The Argentine Claim to the South Orkneys.*

37. The South Orkneys lie some 400 miles south-east of the Falkland Islands, and are included in the Falkland Islands Dependencies created by letters patent in 1908 (see paragraph 1). There are two principal islands, Laurie Island, 26 miles long and between half a mile and 11 miles broad, and Coronation Island, 30 miles long and 11 miles broad. The strategic importance of the group is negligible, but the Falkland Islands Administration derive an increasing revenue from the islands through the grant of whaling licences.

38. The meridian of partition fixed by the Pope in 1494 between the Spanish and Portuguese possessions would place the islands under Portuguese rule, but there is no record of any visit to the islands until 1821, when Captain George Powell, of His Majesty's sloop "Dove," took possession of the islands in the name of King George IV, and carried out a partial survey. He is said to have left a bottle recording the fact of his visit.

39. There is no trace of another visit having been paid to these islands for eighty-two years. In 1903 Dr. Bruce, a British subject and head of a Scottish expedition to the Antarctic, established a meteorological station on Laurie Island. Dr. Bruce left members of his expedition to carry on the work of the station, and during a visit to Buenos Aires he offered the meteorological station to the Argentine Government through Mr. Haggard, the British Minister in Buenos Aires, after a similar offer to this country had been rejected. The Argentine Government accepted the offer, and in July 1904 the Argentine flag replaced the Scottish Lion which the Bruce Expedition had flown, but nothing in the correspondence which passed on that occasion can be construed as a recognition, either express or implied, of Argentine sovereignty over the islands.

40. In 1906 certain administrative acts of the Argentine Government seemed to show that Argentina claimed sovereignty over the islands, and in these circumstances His Majesty's Minister at Buenos Aires was instructed to present a note to affirm that the group was British territory. Similar administrative acts on the part of the Argentine Government led to a reaffirmation of the British title in 1907.

41. In 1908 the Falkland Islands Dependencies were established by letters patent, and a copy of the letters patent was sent to the Argentine Government, who acknowledged its receipt without comment. From this year onwards Great Britain has committed acts of sovereignty by issuing whaling licences and by despatching an administrative officer to the islands during the whaling season.

42. In 1910 a proposal was mooted here to cede the South Orkney Islands to the Argentine without conditions. The proposal was modified in 1911 into a suggestion that the South Orkneys might be ceded in return for the recognition by the Argentine of the British claim to the Falkland Islands. This proposal was opposed by the Colonial Office, who maintained that any offer to cede the South Orkneys might be interpreted by the Argentine as an admission of the weakness of our position in the Falkland Islands. Sir R. Tower having by then succeeded as His Majesty's Minister at Buenos Aires, suggested in October 1911 that the South Orkneys should be ceded in exchange for a site for a Legation. The Colonial Office eventually agreed to this proposal, and, after making informal enquiries of the Argentine Government as to whether the cession of the islands on the terms would be agreeable to them, Sir R. Tower was instructed to arrange with them an "exchange of courtesies" in the form of a convention, under which the South Orkneys would be ceded to Argentina in return for a suitable site for a British Legation house. In the draft convention provision was made for safeguarding the rights of British subjects interested in the whaling industry. The text of the convention had been agreed upon by His Majesty's Government and the Argentine when, in 1914, a new Argentine Government came into office, who were unwilling to go to the expense which their part of the bargain would have involved. This question was not raised again until 1928.

(Explanatory Note.)

When the Argentine Government in a memorandum of the 15th December, 1927, attempted to reopen these negotiations they implied, without stating in so many words, that the original negotiations had broken down because Dr. Bosch had found it difficult to accept the word "cession" in regard to the South Orkneys, and Sir M. Robertson, in transmitting the memorandum, appears to have accepted this as a true statement of the position without any reference to the early correspondence.

as Peter I Island. Later Sir F. Lindley reported that, according to a reliable informant, the Norwegian Government were unlikely to proceed to further annexations. In the circumstances it was decided that it would be wiser to say nothing for the moment at Oslo.

31. In February 1929 the news was received of the annexation of Peter I Island. The same report stated that the "Norvegia" at the time engaged on searching for Dougherty Island. In view of this information, His Majesty's Minister at Oslo was instructed, on the 8th May, 1929, to take an opportunity of drawing the attention of the Norwegian Government to—

(a.) The circumstances attending the lease of Dougherty Island to Norwegians in 1913.

(b.) The fact that in 1926 M. Christensen, the owner of the "Norvegia," himself applied to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for a whaling licence in respect of Dougherty Island, and that the Norwegian naval attaché in London personally assisted M. Christensen in putting forward his application.

32. Sir F. Lindley carried out these instructions without delay at an interview with the Norwegian Prime Minister. The latter took careful note of what was said to him, but did not go further than to state that Dougherty Island would not be annexed by the Norwegian Government without further communication with His Majesty's Government.

(5.) *The French Government and the Falkland Islands Dependencies.*

33. On the 10th May, 1928, the counsellor of the French Embassy left at the Foreign Office a despatch from the Quai d'Orsay instructing him to obtain at once the texts under which the British Government had recently annexed to the "Falkland Islands and Dependencies" Louis-Philippe Land, Joinville Island, together with the territories discovered by Dr. Charcot in 1904-5 and 1908-10 (Loubet, Fallières and Charcot Lands). The despatch added that a decree on the subject was believed to have appeared in the Falkland Islands "Gazette" of the 15th December, 1923. In reply the counsellor was merely supplied with a copy of the letters patent of the 28th March, 1917, defining the extent of the Falkland Islands Dependency, and he was informed that no notice or proclamation on the subject had been published since the publication of the letters patent on the 2nd July, 1917, in the Falkland Islands "Gazette."

34. On the 9th June, 1928, the French Ambassador asked in an official note whether His Majesty's Government had annexed the territories mentioned by the counsellor of the French Embassy a month before. If so, the French Government would be glad to know the date of the annexation and to have the text of the instrument under which the annexation was effected.

35. The facts in regard to the French discoveries are these: As stated in paragraph 1 of this memorandum, the Falkland Islands Dependencies were first established by letters patent in 1908, but the limits of the dependencies were not defined. In 1910 Charcot, a French explorer, discovered land within the area which His Majesty's Government regarded as belonging to the dependencies. So far as is known, Charcot did not claim his discoveries for France at the time, although no British explorer had ever visited the territories which he explored. The letters patent of 1917, defining the limits of the Falkland Islands Dependencies, were intended to make clear our attitude, viz., that we laid claim to all the land lying between certain parallels, even though some of it had never been seen by British explorers. The Falkland Islands "Gazette" was probably not widely read in France, particularly during the war, and so it was that the issue of the letters patent in 1917, with all its implications, must have wholly escaped the notice of the French Government.

36. It was considered undesirable to go into the question with the French Ambassador, and he was merely informed, in a note of the 11th July, 1928, that "Louis-Philippe Land, Joinville Island, Loubet Land, Fallières Land and Charcot Land lie within the area which was defined by letters patent issued on the 28th March, 1917, as constituting the Falkland Islands Dependencies." From the fact that no reply has ever been received to this intimation, it would appear that, for the moment at all events, the French Government are not prepared to dispute the British claim.

as Peter I Island. Later Sir F. Lindley reported that, according to a reliable informant, the Norwegian Government were unlikely to proceed to further annexations. In the circumstances it was decided that it would be wiser to say nothing for the moment at Oslo.

31. In February 1929 the news was received of the annexation of Peter I Island. The same report stated that the "Norvegia" at the time engaged on searching for Dougherty Island. In view of this information, His Majesty's Minister at Oslo was instructed, on the 8th May, 1929, to take an opportunity of drawing the attention of the Norwegian Government to—

(a.) The circumstances attending the lease of Dougherty Island to Norwegians in 1913.

(b.) The fact that in 1926 M. Christensen, the owner of the "Norvegia," himself applied to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for a whaling licence in respect of Dougherty Island, and that the Norwegian naval attaché in London personally assisted M. Christensen in putting forward his application.

32. Sir F. Lindley carried out these instructions without delay at an interview with the Norwegian Prime Minister. The latter took careful note of what was said to him, but did not go further than to state that Dougherty Island would not be annexed by the Norwegian Government without further communication with His Majesty's Government.

(5.) *The French Government and the Falkland Islands Dependencies.*

33. On the 10th May, 1928, the counsellor of the French Embassy left at the Foreign Office a despatch from the Quai d'Orsay instructing him to obtain at once the texts under which the British Government had recently annexed to the "Falkland Islands and Dependencies" Louis-Philippe Land, Joinville Island, together with the territories discovered by Dr. Charcot in 1904-5 and 1908-10 (Loubet, Fallières and Charcot Lands). The despatch added that a decree on the subject was believed to have appeared in the Falkland Islands "Gazette" of the 15th December, 1923. In reply the counsellor was merely supplied with a copy of the letters patent of the 28th March, 1917, defining the extent of the Falkland Islands Dependency, and he was informed that no notice or proclamation on the subject had been published since the publication of the letters patent on the 2nd July, 1917, in the Falkland Islands "Gazette."

34. On the 9th June, 1928, the French Ambassador asked in an official note whether His Majesty's Government had annexed the territories mentioned by the counsellor of the French Embassy a month before. If so, the French Government would be glad to know the date of the annexation and to have the text of the instrument under which the annexation was effected.

35. The facts in regard to the French discoveries are these: As stated in paragraph 1 of this memorandum, the Falkland Islands Dependencies were first established by letters patent in 1908, but the limits of the dependencies were not defined. In 1910 Charcot, a French explorer, discovered land within the area which His Majesty's Government regarded as belonging to the dependencies. So far as is known, Charcot did not claim his discoveries for France at the time, although no British explorer had ever visited the territories which he explored. The letters patent of 1917, defining the limits of the Falkland Islands Dependencies, were intended to make clear our attitude, viz., that we laid claim to all the land lying between certain parallels, even though some of it had never been seen by British explorers. The Falkland Islands "Gazette" was probably not widely read in France, particularly during the war, and so it was that the issue of the letters patent in 1917, with all its implications, must have wholly escaped the notice of the French Government.

36. It was considered undesirable to go into the question with the French Ambassador, and he was merely informed, in a note of the 11th July, 1928, that "Louis-Philippe Land, Joinville Island, Loubet Land, Fallières Land and Charcot Land lie within the area which was defined by letters patent issued on the 28th March, 1917, as constituting the Falkland Islands Dependencies." From the fact that no reply has ever been received to this intimation, it would appear that, for the moment at all events, the French Government are not prepared to dispute the British claim.

25. In spite of the distance at which it was surveyed by Bellingshausen, and the unfavourable weather conditions experienced by Charcot, the existence and position of this island may be regarded as quite definitely established. According to Bellingshausen's observations, the island is situated in approximately 69° S, 90½° W. Its coastline is generally precipitous, and with the exception of these cliffs and the higher slopes of the mountain it was observed to be covered with snow. It appears to rise steeply from the ocean-bed, since Charcot obtained a sounding of 765 fathoms, no bottom, less than 3 miles northward of it. No landing has been made on this island and, from the clifly character of its shores, it would seem that such would be difficult to effect. Owing to its inaccessibility and lack of any natural advantages, it appears to be almost inconceivable that it could ever prove of the slightest utility as a whaling station. As regards its ownership, it is believed never to have been formally claimed by any Power. By discovery, it is incontestably Russian.

26. In August 1928 information was received here as to the intentions of the further expedition which the "Norvegia" was about to make in the Antarctic. The general steps taken by His Majesty's Government, in the light of this information, to safeguard British rights are described elsewhere in this memorandum. It suffices to say here that, according to our reports, one of the objects of the expedition was to ascertain if Peter I Island actually existed, and, if so, to plant the Norwegian flag there. In view of the fact that there was no good ground on which a British claim to the island could be put forward, although the island lay within the limits of the extension to the Falkland Islands Dependencies recommended by the Imperial Conference, it was decided to say nothing to the Norwegian Government on the subject.

27. In February 1929 news was received that the "Norvegia" had formally annexed Peter I Island on the 2nd February, 1929. For the reason indicated above it was decided to raise no objection, and on the 8th May, 1929, a despatch was addressed to His Majesty's Minister at Oslo informing him that he was not to volunteer any statement to the Norwegian Government on the subject of the reported official occupation of Peter I Island by the "Norvegia," but that, if the Norwegian Government mentioned the matter, he should reply that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom make no claim to the island.

(4.) *Norway and Dougherty Island.*

28. This island, alleged to be situated in 59° S., 119° W., is generally regarded as British by right of discovery, having been reported by Captain Dougherty in 1841. This claim is disputable, however, since, if the island exists (its existence has often been called in question by the failure of explorers to find it and by the fact that soundings of more than 2,000 fathoms have been taken in its vicinity), it is undoubtedly identical with the island reported by the American Captain Swain in 1800 and Captain Macy, also an American, in about 1806. No recorded landing has ever been made upon it.

29. In 1913 His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom leased the island to two Norwegians for £25 a year, but the licensees did not even attempt to locate the island and the lease terminated in 1920. In 1926 M. Christensen, the owner of the "Norvegia," applied to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for a licence to use the island as a whaling base. The Antarctic Committee of the Imperial Conference of 1926 expressed the opinion that the issue of a licence would constitute a useful assertion of authority in the area, and that it might be desirable that the issue of the licence might be followed by action involving the eastward extension of the Ross Dependency and the westward extension of the Falkland Islands Dependencies. A provisional draft licence was sent to M. Christensen early in 1927 pending the issue of the licence in its final form by the New Zealand Government. M. Christensen asked that the question of the licence should be shelved until he knew the result of an expedition which he was then sending to explore the area, and he did not subsequently bring up the question.

30. As stated above in paragraph 26, we received information in August 1928 of the intentions of the further expedition to be undertaken by the "Norvegia." The report stated that the expedition hoped to find and annex Dougherty Island, as well

satisfaction. As regards the territorial question, whilst the Norwegian Government fully appreciated the special interest of Great Britain, nevertheless they felt that the issues involved should be kept quite distinct from that of Bouvet Island, with which it had no connexion whatever. Lord Cushendun replied that, whilst His Majesty's Government did not wish to establish any direct connexion between the two questions, they felt that, in view of the readiness to relinquish all claims to Bouvet Island, they were entitled to expect, more or less simultaneously, some such assurance as would set their mind at rest on the other matter. The Minister then changed his tactics and developed a new argument. If, he said, there was to be some *quid pro quo* for the renunciation of the British claim to Bouvet Island, such a one existed at the other end of the globe. There were certain regions in the Arctic (viz., the Otto Sverdrup Islands) which were indisputably Norwegian by priority of discovery—discovery much more recent than the British discovery of Bouvet Island—where the Canadian Government were exercising some sort of administrative authority. Lord Cushendun replied that this was a matter quite outside the scope of the present discussion, and that he was confident that the Norwegian Government, on reconsideration, would give the required assurances in regard to the areas mentioned in the Imperial Conference proceedings. The Minister undertook to consult further with his Government and promised to resume the discussion at a later date.

23. On the 15th November, 1928, the Norwegian Minister called once more on Sir R. Lindsay and read two memoranda. The first was to the effect that the Norwegian Government would always be glad to discuss with His Majesty's Government questions of common interest such as the protection of whales and seals in Polar regions, and in this matter they sincerely desired to meet the wishes of His Majesty's Government as far as possible. The second memorandum was in the following terms:—

“The Norwegian Government have not sufficient knowledge of the basis upon which are founded the British claims to each one of the territories which the last Imperial Conference asserted to be British. The Norwegian Government, however, are prepared to express their willingness to refrain from occupying any land within these territories.”

Sir R. Lindsay then informed the Minister that His Majesty's Government withdrew all claim to Bouvet Island and would raise no objection to its annexation by the Norwegian Government. No more formal notification was ever made to the Norwegian Government of the renunciation of the British claim to Bouvet Island, but the decision of His Majesty's Government was made public in the form of answers to questions in Parliament. The substance of the two memoranda read by the Norwegian Minister at his last interview was not made public either in this country or in Norway.

On the 14th January, 1930, a Bill was introduced into the Norwegian Parliament proposing that Norwegian municipal law, criminal law and laws on judicial procedure should be applied to the new Norwegian possessions of Bouvet and Jan Mayen (Arctic) Islands. This law was adopted unanimously on the 14th February and received Royal assent on the 27th February, Jan Mayen Island becoming under the terms of the law an integral part of the Kingdom of Norway and therefore inalienable, while Bouvet Island was to be considered as a Norwegian “possession” only and therefore not untransferable.

(3.) *The Norwegian Claim to Peter I Island.*

24. This island was discovered by the Russian Antarctic Expedition under Captain F. G. von Bellingshausen on the 21st January, 1821. He had it in sight for two days, but was unable to approach nearer to it than about 20 miles on account of extensive pack-ice. In 1898 the “Belgica,” of the Belgian Antarctic Expedition, under De Garlache, passed, while locked in the pack-ice and drifting, about 90 miles southward of the island, thus showing that it could not form part of the Antarctic Continent. Bellingshausen had not circumnavigated it, but passed to the northward, running from west to east. The island, which was the first land to be discovered within the Antarctic Circle, was again sighted, for the first and only time since its discovery, by Charcot, in “*Pourquoi Pas?*” on the 15th January, 1910. He passed about 2½ miles northward of it in foggy weather.

send a reply to the Norwegian Government simply informing them of the existence of a prior British claim and reserving our rights. A note in these terms was addressed to the Norwegian Minister on the 15th February, 1928.

18. At the same time it was considered desirable to give the Norwegian Government timely warning of British claims in the Antarctic, in order, if possible, to forestall any further annexations by the "Norvegia" expedition. A despatch was accordingly addressed to His Majesty's Minister at Oslo instructing him to state that His Majesty's Government had learnt from the Norwegian Minister in London that the master of the "Norvegia" was authorised to hoist the Norwegian flag on any lands which belonged to no other Power, and that, consequently, it seemed desirable to remind the Norwegian Government of the discussions at the Imperial Conference of 1926 in connexion with those regions contained in the published Summary of Proceedings. Sir Francis Lindley was to add that the motive of his communication was merely the desire to avoid the risk of complications arising from any acts which might be performed by the expedition in ignorance of the existence of a British title to the areas referred to in the Imperial Conference report.

19. On the 23rd April, 1928, the Norwegian Minister replied at great length to the British note of the 15th February, 1928. His principal points were:—

(a.) Bouvet is not included in the areas specified in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings.

(b.) The Norwegian Government were not aware of a British title to Bouvet, and no reference to such a title can be found in any ordinary reference book.

(c.) It is doubtful whether the island discovered by Captain Norris was in effect Bouvet. In any event, the British title cannot be regarded as valid as nothing was done for over 100 years to follow up the discovery or to make a public claim to the island.

(d.) The Norwegian Government on these grounds maintain their claim.

20. It was decided to send no written reply to the Norwegian Minister, but to endeavour to reach a compromise on certain lines to be discussed in conversations. On the 4th October, 1928, Sir R. Lindsay received the Norwegian Minister and said that whilst His Majesty's Government were anxious to approach the question in a reasonable spirit, wider issues were involved than that relating to Bouvet Island alone, and that the two Governments were really approaching the discussion of the whole Antarctic question. Of this there were two aspects; the first was political and territorial. Considerations of geography and our efforts in exploration entitled Great Britain and the Dominions to a special position, and he must say frankly that it was the preference of the British Government, and even more of the Dominions, that the Empire should have no neighbours at all in the Antarctic or in its adjacent islands. As regards the second aspect, which was commercial, the only governmental control over the whaling industry in southern waters was British. This control had always been exercised in an impartial manner between British and Norwegian interests, and, if whales were not to be exterminated, it was indispensable that control should continue. His Majesty's Government had no desire to exclude Norwegians from the industry, and they were anxious to come to an agreement with the Norwegian Government as to the best means of securing further and even more efficient protection for the whaling industry. To sum up, there were three elements to be considered:—

(a.) The desire of His Majesty's Government that no further annexations should be made by other Powers in the Antarctic.

(b.) Their desire to reach a satisfactory agreement with Norway in regard to the whaling industry.

(c.) The possession of Bouvet Island, a question which might be regarded as separate from the wider issues.

21. Without intending to drive a bargain, he was authorised to say that His Majesty's Government would have no hesitation in recognising Norwegian sovereignty over Bouvet Island if they could be met substantially on the other questions. The Norwegian Minister undertook to obtain the instructions of his Government on the suggestion which had been thrown out.

22. On the 16th October, 1928, Lord Cushendun, then Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, received the Norwegian Minister, who said that, in regard to the question of whaling, he was sure that his Government could give us full

claim, both by discovery and by formal taking of possession, His Majesty's Government are unable to see on what grounds a Norwegian claim could be substantiated.

12. Once more the Norwegian Government waited a long time before pursuing the controversy, and it was not until the 8th November, 1929, that a reply was received from the Norwegian Minister. The note merely states that the Norwegian Government, after careful consideration, are obliged to maintain the contentions set out in the Norwegian notes of the 28th February, 1925, and of the 13th May, 1927. As regards the statement that the English translation of Lieutenant Prestrud's account does not show that he formally took possession of King Edward VII Land, the Norwegian Government desire to point out that in the Norwegian edition of Captain Amundsen's book there is an account by Lieutenant Prestrud of his expedition in which he records having taken possession of the territory. A translation of the relevant passage reads as follows: "Before we left the summit (viz., one of the summits which later on was christened 'Scott's Nunatakker'), the Norwegian flag was hoisted, and I took possession of the land in the name of His Majesty the King. A cairn of stones was built and a report of our visit was deposited there."

13. The reference in the Norwegian note to the Norwegian text of the relevant passage of Captain Amundsen's book has been checked and found correct, but no decision has yet been reached as to the terms of the reply of His Majesty's Government. The fact that the Norwegian Government waited for two years before replying to the last British note renders it unnecessary to pursue the controversy immediately, and a little delay may be of assistance in finding a solution.

(2.) *The Norwegian Claim to Bouvet Island.*

14. Bouvet Island lies well north of the Antarctic Circle in latitude 54° 26' S. and longitude 3° 24' E. It was first sighted by a Frenchman in 1739, and has been several times rediscovered, namely, by Lindsay (British) in 1809, Morrell (American) in 1822 and Norris (British) in 1825, as well as by several American sealers in the period between 1878-93. Formal possession was taken of the island by Captain Norris in 1825, when he effected a landing, hoisted the British flag and took possession in the name of King George IV.

15. On the 19th January, 1928, the Norwegian Minister stated in a note that a Norwegian expedition to the Southern Atlantic in the steamship "Norvegia" had been authorised to take possession for Norway of any new land which might be found, and that the master of the "Norvegia" had occupied Bouvet Island on the 1st December, 1927, established a depot there and hoisted the Norwegian flag.

16. The British claim to the island was admittedly not a very strong one. The general view taken by writers on international law is that discovery confers only an inchoate title which, if it is to be perfected, must be followed by occupation. This thesis must be modified in some degree in the case of regions which are difficult of access and where occupation in the ordinary sense of the term is physically difficult or even impossible. In such cases it may be argued that some continuous show of interest will suffice, such as the paying of periodical visits and the establishment of some sort of control. Unfortunately, no such visits have ever been carried out in the case of Bouvet Island by British expeditions, although an attempt was made in 1926 by the "Discovery," which sighted the island but was unable to approach. On the other hand, there had been an undoubted exercise of sovereignty in that in 1927, some months before Bouvet Island was occupied by the Norwegian expedition, a whaling licence in respect of Bouvet and Thompson Islands had been granted by the Colonial Office to Messrs. Rasmussen and Co., of Norway.

17. So much for the legal aspect. From the practical point of view it was generally recognised that possession of the island is worth nothing to this country apart from its possible value as a whaling centre. On the other hand, account had to be taken of the effect which our attitude towards the Norwegian claim might have on our claims elsewhere in the Antarctic, some of which might be open to challenge. Whilst the possibility of an eventual compromise was not excluded, it was therefore decided that in the first instance it would be a mistake to do anything which might encourage the Norwegian Government to make claims elsewhere or to dispute British claims in other areas. It was accordingly decided that the best course would be to

(1.) *Norwegian Claims in the Ross Dependency.*

10. In 1927 the Norwegian Government returned to the charge and replied to the British note of the 3rd November, 1925. In a note dated the 13th May, 1927, the Norwegian Minister stated:—

(a.) That his Government took it for granted that the Ross Ice Barrier, which does not rest on land but on water, is not meant to be included in the area defined as the Ross Dependency in the Order in Council of the 30th July, 1923.

(b.) The inclusion of King Edward VII Land in the Ross Dependency is not justified. The fact that Captain Scott in 1902 sighted part of King Edward VII Land in 1902 from the sea is not a sufficient ground for claiming British sovereignty over this area. The only man who actually visited the territory was Lieutenant Prestrud, of the Amundsen expedition, who made a sledge journey there with some companions and formally took possession of it in the name of the King of Norway on the 8th December, 1911.

(c.) As regards the conclusion of the British note, the Norwegian Government cannot agree that the fact that Sir E. Shackleton reached a point as far south as 88 degrees, 23 minutes in 1909, and from there determined the plateau on which the South Pole is situated, constitutes a basis for claiming British sovereignty to this plateau, which in 1911 was actually reached by Captain Amundsen and formally taken possession of by him on behalf of the King of Norway. The Norwegian Government consider that these facts entitle Norway to claim sovereignty over the South Pole Plateau within the 89th degree of southern latitude; they also consider Norway to have a priority to any claim to the territories on both sides of Captain Amundsen's route to the South Pole, and they would define these territories as embracing a sector from longitude 120° west to 175° west, south of the 85th degree.

11. On the 9th December, 1927, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, after obtaining the concurrence of His Majesty's Government in New Zealand, replied to the three points raised in the note as follows:—

(a.) According to the available information, there appears little doubt that at certain points even at the seaward edge the barrier rests on land which possibly rises above sea-level, and it seems not improbable that the same may be true as regards other parts of the barrier; in any event, the suggestion that the barrier is afloat must depend on inference owing to the impossibility of taking soundings through the ice. In general, the British and New Zealand Governments consider that in the case of an ice barrier which is to all intents and purposes a permanent extension of the land proper, there is good reason for treating it as though it were *terra firma*.

(b.) Whilst His Majesty's Government recognise that prior to Lieutenant Prestrud's visit, no one, so far as is known, had set foot on King Edward VII Land, there can be no doubt of the reality of Captain Scott's discovery of that territory nearly ten years earlier and of the accuracy of his charting, which is fully confirmed by Lieutenant Prestrud's own account of his journey. He not only refers to Captain Scott as "our respected precursor," but uses his names and gives to the only actual land which he himself saw the name of "Scott's Nunataks." Moreover, the "exploration" on which the Norwegian Government base their claim was confined to a short and hurried journey by a party of three men for a distance of about 150 miles from their base and the traversing of about 25 miles of the glaciated surface of the land in question; the so-called "occupation" was no more than a fortnight's camping, followed by an immediate return to the base, which cannot be regarded as occupation in any sense of the word and cannot possibly have the effect of overriding the claim of His Majesty's Government based on prior discovery; and, finally, there is no indication in the English translation of Lieutenant Prestrud's narrative that he took possession of the land or had authority from Captain Amundsen to do so.

(c.) The Norwegian note presumably does not purport to question the fact that Sir E. Shackleton reached and discovered the South Pole Plateau, traversed the greater part of its extent between the point where he first reached it and the South Pole and took formal possession of the plateau in the name of His Majesty the King. Captain Amundsen's discoveries cannot (with the exception of his "appearance of land" in or about latitude 81°–82° south) be regarded as other than an extension of those made by Sir E. Shackleton, with which from a geographical standpoint they are indissolubly connected. In view of the fact that Sir E. Shackleton has the prior

in which, after reviewing the position, they made the following definite recommendations:—

“We recommend that the gradual process of establishing British domination in the Antarctic area should be divided into three stages.

“The first should be an intimation to the world at large, through the publication in the proceedings of the Imperial Conference of a reference to the intention to perfect the title to the seven areas mentioned above. All these areas may be treated as British by discovery, and such discovery should be regarded as having conferred an inchoate British title.

“The second should be a formal local-taking possession, by an officer authorised for the purpose, of such of these areas as are not known to have been so taken possession of at the time of discovery.

“The third should be the issue of letters patent annexing the area and making provision for its Government.

“In the first stage, *i.e.*, the public intimation of the intention to appropriate, the territories should be mentioned only by name; no limits by latitude and longitude should be given. In the case of No. 5, named ‘Wilkes Land’ by the Australian Antarctic Expedition, it should be described as lying to the west of the territory of Adélie Land without specifying the limits of that land. Any attempt at the present stage to dispute the French title to Adélie Land or to question the extent of that territory given in the Embassy note of the 29th March, 1913, would provoke controversy with the French at a moment when controversy should be avoided.

“The second stage will render desirable the despatch of an expedition to the Antarctic. How soon such an expedition may be feasible, and what areas it should visit, are questions for future consideration and arrangement.

“The third stage, the issue of letters patent, will give an opportunity of enlarging the areas to be annexed in the light of the discoveries made by the expedition to be sent out to visit them, and will also give an opportunity of fixing boundaries to the areas annexed by meridians converging at the South Pole.”

8. The discussion at the Imperial Conference of the Antarctic question was recorded in the following statement, which was embodied in the published Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference:—

“The question of Antarctic exploration was discussed between representatives of the Governments interested. There are certain areas in these regions to which a British title already exists by virtue of discovery. These areas include:—

- “(i.) The outlying part of Coats Land, *viz.*, the portion not comprised within the Falkland Islands Dependencies.
- “(ii.) Enderby Land.
- “(iii.) Kemp Land.
- “(iv.) Queen Mary Land.
- “(v.) The area which lies to the west of Adélie Land and which, on its discovery by the Australian Antarctic Expedition in 1912, was denominated Wilkes Land.
- “(vi.) King George V Land.
- “(vii.) Oates Land.

“The representatives of the Governments concerned studied the information available concerning these areas with special reference to their possible utilisation for further developing exploration and scientific research in the Antarctic regions.”

III.—FROM THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE TO 1930.

9. After the Imperial Conference a period followed in which His Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand were actively engaged both in carrying out the policy laid down at the conference and in dealing with the claims of foreign countries. The questions involved had often to be considered concurrently, but for the purpose of this memorandum it will be convenient to deal with each question separately.

action to establish British sovereignty with Australian control over the Antarctic regions from 160° E. to 90° E. longitude (the sector which His Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand had agreed should be the Australian sector). In September 1925 the Commonwealth Government stated their views at length. They may be summarised as follows:—

(a.) Any efforts made by France to extend her control over regions to which she cannot adduce good title should be strongly resisted.

(b.) Control and administration of Antarctic lands should be in the hands of countries whose territories are situated nearest to them.

(c.) If the French Government consented to apply this principle to the Australian sector, they might agree to surrender Adélie Land in return for control of a certain portion of the Antarctic mainland south of Kerguelen Island, the Crozets and Madagascar.

(d.) The general object of Australia was to prevent the establishment by any other country of a considerable enclave in the Australian sector.

II.—THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF 1926.

6. In 1926, when the Imperial Conference met, the question of the British claims in the Antarctic was one of the items on the agenda. The preparatory work was done by an inter-departmental committee composed of representatives of the Foreign Office, Dominions Office, Colonial Office and Admiralty. The committee considered the Australian statement summarised above, and came to the conclusion that the British note to the French Government in 1913 greatly exaggerated the extent of the land which France could claim. Whilst the French Government naturally did not correct the exaggeration, they never advanced any such far-reaching claim themselves, and their claim should not be allowed to extend beyond the area actually sighted and charted by Captain d'Urville in 1840, viz., the area between 136½° E. and 142° E. Within these limits the French claim was indisputable. As regards the proposal for an exchange, the committee doubted whether the French Government would agree. In any event, if the principle advocated by Australia were admitted and applied, it would give an opening to the Argentine, which has never abandoned her claim to the Falkland Islands themselves, and has of recent years indicated that this claim extends to the islands dependencies. The committee therefore took the view that a French enclave in the Australian sector is inevitable. On the assumption that the French claim to Adélie Land is confined to the area 136½° E.—142° E., the committee considered that the following territories, with their off-lying islands, between the Falkland Islands and Ross Dependencies could reasonably be annexed, and they recommended that action should be taken to assert a British claim to these territories:—

- (1.) The north-eastern part of Coats Land, namely, that lying between longitude 20° W. (the eastern limit of the Falkland Islands Dependencies) and longitude 16½° W.
- (2.) Enderby Land, lying between longitude 45° E. and longitude 53° E.
- (3.) Kemp Land, lying between longitude 58½° E. and longitude 60° E.
- (4.) Queen Mary Land, lying between longitude 86° E. and longitude 101° E.
- (5.) Wilkes Land, lying between longitude 131° E. and longitude 135½° E.

(NOTE.—This stretch of coast was so named by the Mawson Expedition of 1911–14, which discovered and charted it.)

- (6.) King George V Land, lying between longitude 142° E. and longitude 153° E.
- (7.) Oates Land, lying between longitude 157° E. and longitude 159° E.

In addition, the committee recommended that, as in the cases of the Falkland Islands and the Ross Dependencies, the British claims should be defined so as to include the whole of the land lying within the various prescribed meridians and between the coast and the South Pole, and that the French claim to Adélie Land should be regarded as having the same extension to the South Pole.

7. The views and recommendations of the inter-departmental committee were generally approved by the committee set up by the Imperial Conference to consider the question of British policy in the Antarctic. This committee issued a report,

3. In July 1923 an Order in Council was issued establishing the Ross Dependency and placing it under the Government of New Zealand. The dependency was described in the Order as:—

“That part of His Majesty’s Dominions in the Antarctic Seas which comprises all the islands and territories between the 160th degree of east longitude and the 150th degree of west longitude which are situated south of the 60th degree of south latitude.”

The whole coast of the Ross Dependency was British by discovery, and the Order in Council aroused no comment from any foreign Government except the Norwegian Government, who enquired in 1925 whether they could assume that:—

“(1.) Apart from such islands which may be situated within territorial waters of Victoria Land and Edward VII’s Land, the annexation is meant to comprise such islands only the existence of which is at present known and which have been discovered by British citizens or by expeditions under the British flag.

“(2.) The southern boundaries of the dependency—of which nothing is said in the Order in Council—and its eastern boundaries south of Edward VII’s Land, are meant to be drawn in such a way as not to make the annexation comprise any part of the territory immediately circumjacent to the South Pole, which, as will be known, was taken possession of in the name of the King of Norway by Captain Roald Amundsen in December 1911, under the name of Haakon VII’s Plateau, nor to comprise the territories on both sides of Captain Amundsen’s route to the South Pole south of the said Edward VII’s Land and including, *i.a.*, Queen Maud’s Range.”

The note added that, though the Norwegian Government did not propose at the time to claim sovereignty over the territory referred to under point 2, they considered that the discovery and annexation referred to constituted a valid basis for a claim of priority to acquire such territories whenever the requirements of international law as to effective occupation of a new territory shall have been fulfilled. His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom replied on the 3rd November, 1925, that as regards point 1, they desired to observe that there is no coast or island known to exist within the dependency which is not indisputably a British discovery and that, except possibly in the region immediately northward of King Edward VII’s Land, there seems to be no likelihood of any fresh discoveries of islands within the limits of the dependency. As regards point 2, no southern boundary of the Ross Dependency was specified in the Order in Council because the western and eastern boundaries mentioned in the Order meet at a point at the South Pole. In conclusion, His Majesty’s Government declined to admit the Norwegian claim based on Captain Amundsen’s discoveries, and pointed out that the South Pole plateau had already been determined by Sir Ernest Shackleton who, in 1909, reached a point on it less than 100 miles from the Pole and took formal possession of the plateau for Great Britain.

4. In 1924 the French Government took steps to assert their claim to Adélie Land by the issue of formal decrees, but the decrees did not define the boundaries of the area claimed. The French claim to this territory is based on a landing made in 1840 by Captain d’Urville of the French navy. In 1911 His Majesty’s Government received an application for the grant of a whaling licence in various parts of the Antarctic, including the territory known as Adélie Land or Wilkes Land. They thereupon enquired of the French Government whether they claimed “that portion of the Antarctic Continent known as Wilkes Land.” The French Government replied to the effect that the part of the Antarctic Continent known as Adélie Land or Wilkes Land had been taken possession of on behalf of France by Captain d’Urville in 1840. This claim was implicitly recognised by this country in 1913, when it was decided to give the name of King George V Land to a tract discovered by Dr. Mawson. It was then considered desirable to inform the French Government of our intention, and the note stated that His Majesty’s Government were aware of the claim of the French Government to Adélie Land, and that since it was understood that the extent of the land named by Captain d’Urville was about 150 miles between 66° and 67° south latitude and 136° and 147° east longitude, the new district to be named would not touch on French claims. The French Government did not reply to this note.

5. The issue of the French decree in 1924 asserting a claim to Adélie Land led the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia to raise the question of taking

ANNEX.

MEMORANDUM RESPECTING TERRITORIAL CLAIMS IN
THE ANTARCTIC FROM 1908 TO 1930.

 [WITH MAP.]

- I.—THE PERIOD BEFORE THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF 1926.
- II.—THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF 1926.
- III.—FROM THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE TO 1930.
- (1.) Norwegian claims in the Ross Dependency.
 - (2.) The Norwegian claim to Bouvet Island.
 - (3.) The Norwegian claim to Peter I Island.
 - (4.) The Norwegian claim to Dougherty Island.
 - (5.) France and the Falkland Islands Dependencies.
 - (6.) Argentina and the South Orkneys.
 - (7.) The United States and the South Orkneys.
 - (8.) Admiral Byrd's expedition.
 - (9.) Sir Douglas Mawson's expedition.
 - (10.) Sir Hubert Wilkins's expedition.
 - (11.) Steps taken to prevent Norwegian encroachments in the Antarctic.

I.—THE PERIOD BEFORE THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF 1926.

THE first step taken to assert British control over any part of the Antarctic mainland was the creation by letters patent in 1908 of the Falkland Islands Dependencies. These letters patent, which were published on the 1st September, 1908, do not appear to have evoked any protest from other Powers, although part of the coast claimed had been discovered by foreign explorers. In 1917 amending letters patent were issued in which the definition of the dependencies was modified into its present form.

2. The annexation of the Falkland Islands Dependencies was effected owing to the importance of the whaling industry. Subsequent experience confirmed the opinions held as to the value of the whaling industry and as to the desirability of ensuring that it should be as far as possible conducted under British auspices. Further consideration was accordingly given in 1919 to the question of extending British control over the Antarctic regions. In 1920 the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand were informed that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom had come to the conclusion that the whole of the Antarctic should ultimately be included within the British Empire, and that, while the time had not yet arrived when a claim to all the continental territories should be put forward, it seemed desirable that a definite and consistent policy should be followed of extending and asserting British control. It was considered that the most important practical step at the time was the assertion of British sovereignty over the Ross Sea coasts and their hinterland. After discussion with the Commonwealth and New Zealand Governments it was decided that the two Dominions should have separate spheres of control in the Antarctic, and that the Ross Sea area should be placed under New Zealand. In June 1922 a Norwegian firm applied for a whaling licence for the Ross Sea, and, after consultation with the New Zealand Government, a licence was issued in December 1922, granting the use, in connexion with the proposed whaling operations, of the territorial waters in the Ross Sea and Antarctic Ocean between longitude 160 E. and longitude 150 W.

inaccessible by sea, it seemed almost certain that they would choose the former. While it was the case that no claim to this sector or to any part of it had been advanced by any Power, it was felt that the sector, by reason of its geographical situation, was one in which His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa might conceivably be interested. The position was therefore explained to the Union Government, who concurred in the view that, in the event of the Norwegian expedition which was then in Antarctic waters proceeding to explore the sector, and claim territory in it for the Norwegian Crown, no grounds existed on which objection could be taken. Shortly afterwards, the Norwegian expedition turned its attention to this sector, and succeeded in discovering two new stretches of territory, of which, it is understood, formal possession was taken. No communication has so far been received from the Norwegian Government with regard to their discoveries, but it is to be anticipated that the claims made by the expedition will be formally confirmed.

It may be mentioned in passing that, while precise particulars of the territories discovered by the Norwegian expedition are not yet available, it would not appear from the reports so far received that these discoveries will in any way prejudice the British claim to the whole of Coats Land. Public assertion of title to that portion of Coats Land which lies outside the boundaries of the Falkland Islands Dependencies (in addition to the six areas mentioned above) was made in the Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1926, and, though it has not yet been found possible to organise an expedition to take formal possession of the territory, precautions have been taken, so far as possible, to avoid encroachments by foreign Powers. While, therefore, it is to be regretted that the Norwegian penetration into this sector has interfered with the completion of the full programme for the extension of British control recommended by the Imperial Conference of 1926, it must be recognised that this was inevitable in the circumstances, and some consolation may be derived from the fact that all existing British claims have been maintained intact.

As regards the remaining sector, viz., that between the Falkland Islands Dependencies and the Ross Sea, it was hoped that, as a result of Sir Hubert Wilkins's two expeditions in 1928-29 and 1929-30 (of which details are given within), new territory might have been discovered and claimed for the Crown. Unfortunately, however, owing to adverse weather conditions, Sir H. Wilkins was forced to confine himself almost entirely to territory admittedly within the existing boundaries of the Falkland Islands Dependencies, and, though he made one notable flight outside the boundaries of the Dependencies and actually succeeded in penetrating as far south as 73°, he failed to reach the mainland of the Antarctic Continent.

Meanwhile, attention had been paid to the eastern portion of this sector by the United States expedition under the leadership of Rear-Admiral Byrd, and the latest reports indicate that two new territories (comprising Marie Byrd Land and the hinterland south of it) adjoining the western boundary of the Ross Dependency were discovered and claimed for the United States. The traditional attitude of the United States Government has been to hold themselves aloof from territorial claims in the Antarctic; whether the pressure that has been brought to bear on them as a result of the public interest roused by the Byrd expedition will lead to a departure from this attitude remains to be seen, but there is in any case no reason to suppose that they will fail to respect the boundaries of the Ross Dependency with the same scrupulous care which Rear-Admiral Byrd himself appears to have exhibited.

Even, however, when every allowance is made for possible claims by Norway and the United States, there still remains a vast stretch of coastline lying between longitude 80° W. and 140° W. which has never been explored, either from the sea or from the air. It is to be hoped that when the work of Sir Douglas Mawson's expedition is complete and the proposed Commonwealth sector has been formally constituted a Dependency of the Commonwealth of Australia, opportunity will arise for the exploration on behalf of the Empire of this hitherto unexplored territory.

Printed for the Imperial Conference. September 1930.

SECRET.

Copy No. 131

E. (30) 20.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, 1930.

POLICY IN THE ANTARCTIC.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

IT will be recalled that at the Imperial Conference, 1926, it was recommended that the policy of His Majesty's Governments should be, in effect, that of the gradual establishment of British control over the whole of the Antarctic Continent, apart from those areas to which a good foreign title already existed.

This policy has been actively pursued during the last four years by His Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand, who have throughout acted in the closest collaboration. A memorandum explaining the present position, from the point of view of territorial claims, is attached, together with a map showing the areas so far explored (Annex).

It will be seen that, while it is still true that only two sectors of the Antarctic Continents have so far been brought within the limits of the Empire by formal instruments, good progress has been made towards the addition of a third, namely, the sector between Enderby Land and the Ross Dependency (apart from the French territory of Adélie Land). An assertion of title to six areas in this sector was made in the published Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1926, and this was followed up in 1929 by the despatch to the sector of a scientific and exploratory expedition organised by His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and led by Sir Douglas Mawson, who was empowered to take possession in the name of His Majesty both of the six areas mentioned and of any other territory that might be discovered. The work accomplished by this expedition in the Antarctic season 1929-30, particulars of which are given in the attached memorandum, included the recharting of the coast line of Enderby Land and Kemp Land and the discovery of new territory, named MacRobertson Land, adjoining Kemp Land. Formal possession was taken of these territories in the name of His Majesty by Sir Douglas Mawson. It has been decided by the Commonwealth Government that the work of the expedition should be continued during the Antarctic season 1930-31, and it is hoped that by the end of the season the expedition will have succeeded in visiting the remainder of the sector, and that the way will then be clear for the control of the whole sector (apart from Adélie Land) to be formally vested in His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia.

If this should be the case, there would remain only two sectors of the Antarctic Continent outside the Empire—

- (1) the sector between Enderby Land and the Falkland Islands Dependencies;
- (2) the sector between the Falkland Islands Dependencies and the Ross Dependency.

With regard to the former sector, the position has changed since the last Imperial Conference, since it has now become a focus of Norwegian activity. The Norwegians have of late years been taking an increasing interest in the Antarctic, and it became necessary during the last Antarctic season to warn them against encroachment on the proposed Commonwealth sector. It was recognised, however, that this would leave only two unclaimed sectors, viz., those mentioned above, to which their activities might be directed, and as the latter was reported to be virtually

'Norvegia' expedition was reported to have occupied territory situated between Enderby Land and Kemp Land, and therefore in an area to which His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia, with the support of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, considered that they had an unimpeachable claim. In view of the previous assurances given by the Norwegian Government, His Majesty's Government felt sure that the explanation of the proceedings of the 'Norvegia' expedition was to be found in the fact that that expedition was a private undertaking, and that its action, recently reported in the press, had been taken without the special authority of the Norwegian Government. They were accordingly highly gratified to learn, not only that on practical grounds the Norwegian Government did not attach importance to possession of the territory in question, but that, as reported in the latest press messages, the 'Norvegia' had moved to the west of Enderby Land and proposed to restrict her operations to unclaimed areas between Enderby Land and Coats Land.

"In the circumstances, and having regard to the friendly relations subsisting between the two countries, His Majesty's Government feel confident that the Norwegian Government would not desire to pursue a claim to the territory in question which His Majesty's Government would feel bound to contest, and they trust that the 'Norvegia' will adhere to her intended programme, as reported in the press."

81. M. Mowinckel's only comment was that he was glad to have the views of His Majesty's Government in this form, which would preclude misunderstanding.

82. Mr. Wingfield felt that now that His Majesty's Government had put it on record that they will not be able to recognise any annexation by Norway of land between Kemp and Enderby Land, the Norwegian Government would endeavour to get out of the difficulty resulting from the recent hoisting of the Norwegian flag either by hoping that the matter would be forgotten or by declaring that Norway had no interest in annexing the territory.

83. The present reports available as to the subsequent movements of the "Norvegia" are still rather indeterminate, but the general effect seems to be that some 200 miles of new coastline in the Enderby Land-Coats Land sector (stretching from 8° 30' west latitude to Coats Land) were discovered by the Norwegian expedition. His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa were warned in advance that the Norwegian expedition was likely to direct its activities to this sector, and agreed that, in the event of its doing so and claiming for the Norwegian Crown the territory discovered, no grounds existed on which objection could be taken. In fact, however, no claims based on the discoveries of the expedition have yet been put forward by the Norwegian Government.

Foreign Office, July 31, 1930.

76. It was decided that it would not be desirable to reply officially to this note, but that the best course would be for Mr. Wingfield, the newly-appointed Minister to Oslo, to take an early opportunity of explaining, in the friendliest terms, that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia, entirely supported by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, consider their right to the whole so-called Australian sector unimpeachable and are not prepared to recognise any other country's sovereignty over any part of the sector (except that of France over Adélie Land). Feeling on this subject is very strong, and there can be no possibility of any withdrawal from this position. While on this subject, Mr. Wingfield was to mention, as a matter on which His Majesty's Government wished to keep the Norwegian Government fully informed, that Sir Hubert Wilkins was continuing this season his exploration of the Antarctic regions of the Falkland Islands Dependencies and of the territory to the west of it as far as the Ross Sea Dependency. Sir H. Wilkins, like Sir D. Mawson, had received a commission from the King, which empowered him to take possession, in the King's name, of such territories now unknown as might be discovered in the course of his expedition. Sir H. Wilkins was actually engaged on this task.

77. If M. Mowinkel replied that His Majesty's Government were attempting to annex the whole Antarctic continent and islands, Mr. Wingfield was to deny the charge in the following terms: His Majesty's Government, out of friendship to Norway, waived their claim to Bouvet Island. They have not protested against Norway's claim to Peter I Island, and he has no knowledge that any claim has ever been put forward to the sector between Enderby Land and Coats Land. In regard to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, Ross Sea Dependency and the sectors now being taken possession of by Sir D. Mawson and Sir H. Wilkins, His Majesty's Government make, however, a claim which they not only regard as unimpeachable but which they have translated, or are translating, into concrete sovereign possession. A large sector of the Antarctic is still left open, and in all the remainder under British sovereignty His Majesty's Governments welcome Norwegian scientific and economic co-operation, and feel sure that this will prove as harmonious in the future as it has in the past. Moreover, His Majesty's Government look with the greatest sympathy upon Norwegian enterprise in Arctic regions, and they hope, before long, to make certain practical proposals for a settlement of all the questions outstanding in those regions which will satisfy both sides.

78. Mr. Wingfield, as soon as he was able to do so, obtained an interview with the Norwegian Prime Minister, and on the 21st December, 1929, made a verbal communication to him in the sense of paragraph 76. The Prime Minister made no comment on the extent of the British claims except to say that Norway could not in principle accept the system of claiming sectors including enormous tracts of sea. As regards the "Norvegia," he gave no indication of the plans of the expedition, but he said that it had been instructed to avoid the territories specified in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings, and that, in any event, any acts of annexation performed by the "Norvegia" would have to be referred to the Norwegian Government for confirmation, when all the circumstances could be taken into consideration.

79. Meanwhile, the first reports of the "Norvegia" expedition had been published in the press on the 1st January, and were to the effect that new land on which the Norwegian flag had been hoisted on the 22nd December had been discovered between Enderby Land and Kemp Land, that is, inside the Australian sector. Mr. Wingfield at once called on the Norwegian Prime Minister, who explained that the "Norvegia" expedition was a purely private venture, and its members could not in any way commit the Norwegian Government. He said that Norway did not wish to acquire possession of territory which could be of no possible use to her, especially as it was inaccessible from the sea.

80. News was subsequently received of the meeting between the "Norvegia" expedition and Sir Douglas Mawson's expedition referred to in paragraph 63, and on the 22nd January, in accordance with instructions received from the Foreign Office, Mr. Wingfield called on the Norwegian Prime Minister and handed him the following memorandum:—

"His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom observe with surprise that, notwithstanding the information communicated to the Norwegian Government in Mr. Gascoigne's aide-mémoire of the 12th October last, the

Deception Island due south over Graham Land, practically to the western limits of the Weddell Sea; (2) from the edge of the pack ice to the south of Charcot Land and back, proving that Charcot Land is an island and not part of the mainland; and (3) from longitude 101° W. to practically as far as latitude 73° S., where he failed to locate the mainland over the Antarctic Continent, thus proving that the mainland in this sector recedes further than is shown on the existing charts. This last flight was the only one undertaken outside the limits of the Falkland Islands Dependencies, and though both on this flight and on two other occasions Sir H. Wilkins dropped the British flag suspended to a parachute, with a document taking possession of the surrounding territory in the name of His Majesty the King, the expedition did not, in fact, succeed in discovering new territory outside the limits of the Falkland Islands Dependencies.

(11.) *Steps taken to prevent Norwegian Encroachments in the Antarctic.*

72. The policy recommended by the Imperial Conference was, in effect, that steps should be taken to bring the whole of the Antarctic, excepting those areas to which a good foreign title already existed, under British control. In order to do this, it was not only necessary to establish a British title by effective occupation, but also, in the meantime, to ward off encroachments by foreign Powers. The expedition of the "Norvegia," in particular, constituted a pressing problem.

73. As stated above in paragraph 18, it was decided early in 1928 to call the attention of the Norwegian Government to the passage in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings dealing with the Antarctic. Later in the year, on learning that Great Britain was willing to waive her claim to Bouvet Island, the Norwegian Government undertook not to occupy any land in the areas specified by the Imperial Conference, but no undertaking was given in regard to the sector between the Ross Sea and the Falkland Islands Dependencies, to which His Majesty's Government had as yet laid no claim.

74. In October 1929 the "Daily News" published articles strongly criticising Norwegian annexationist activities in the Antarctic. These articles were based on telegrams from Sir Douglas Mawson, and aroused the greatest indignation in Norway. In consequence of these indiscretions, it was decided to make a frank communication to the Norwegian Government informing them of the objects of Sir Douglas Mawson's expedition. His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Oslo accordingly addressed a note to the Norwegian Government stating that His Majesty's Government dissociated themselves from the attack in the press, and enclosing a memorandum regarding the voyage of the "Discovery." The essential passage in the memorandum read as follows:—

"The expedition has been arranged for the Antarctic season 1929-30, but may be extended to include a further season. It is the intention of the Commonwealth Government that the expedition should operate *principally* in the sector between Enderby Land and the Ross Sea, with a view to the completion of the geographical and scientific work previously carried out in this sector by Sir Douglas Mawson and by other British explorers and of the formal establishment of a British title to this sector, with the exception of the French territory of Adélie Land."

The Norwegian Government replied immediately on the 14th October, 1929, expressing appreciation of the tone of the communication, and taking note of the information relating to the voyage of the "Discovery."

75. On the 4th November, 1929, the Norwegian Minister addressed a note which represented the considered reply of his Government to the British note regarding the voyage of the "Discovery." He stated that: "The 'Norvegia' expedition is continuing for the season 1929-30 the scientific research work which the expedition has previously carried on in the Antarctic. By a Royal decree of the 4th July last, this expedition has been given a general authorisation—as given to 'Norvegia's' earlier expeditions in previous years—to take possession, in the name of His Majesty the King, of any new land which the expedition might discover and which previously had not been occupied in due form by the Government of any other country. The decree has been issued on the assumption that no land will be occupied which falls within the areas mentioned in the Summary of Proceedings for the Imperial Conference in London in 1926."

further to the west known as Kemp Land and Enderby Land, portions of which, though vaguely reported a hundred years ago, were never since confirmed. The whole of this land and the off-lying islands have been claimed for the Crown.

(10.) *Sir Hubert Wilkins's Expeditions.*

65. In 1928 Sir Hubert Wilkins was preparing an expedition to the Antarctic. His intention was first to proceed to Graham Land, with a view to establishing definitely whether that territory was an island or formed part of the mainland. Having established this, he hoped to fly from Graham Land to King Edward VII Land, *i.e.*, over the unexplored sector between the Ross Sea and the Falkland Islands Dependencies.

66. At the time it was believed that the "Norvegia" intended to visit and possibly annex Dougherty Island and Peter I Island, both of which are situated in this unexplored sector. It was possible that the "Norvegia" might discover and annex other territories in the area, and it was also possible that Commander Byrd might fly over portions of the unexplored sector from his relatively neighbouring base in the Ross Sea.

67. These considerations led to a suggestion here that use might be made of the Wilkins expedition to forestall possible Norwegian or American claims. It was felt that although Sir Hubert Wilkins had obtained his funds in America chiefly from the sale of press rights, yet he would probably be willing to fall in with the suggestion. He was accordingly consulted by telegraph, and on the 29th October, 1928, he replied from the Falkland Islands to the effect that he was honoured to accept and would, if possible, drop or plant the British flag in the Weddell Sea area between the Falkland Islands and the Ross Dependency. The Governor of the Falkland Islands accordingly gave Sir Hubert formal authority in writing to take possession of any land or island which he might discover between the western limit of the Falkland Islands Dependencies and the Ross Sea Dependency. Two days later, the expedition left Stanley for Deception Island.

68. On the 2nd February, 1929, Sir Hubert Wilkins returned to Stanley on his way back to the United States and reported that he had, on the 19th December, 1928, made a flight from Deception Island over Graham Land to approximately latitude $71^{\circ} 30' S.$, longitude $63^{\circ} W.$ The British flag was dropped on what was believed to be part of the Antarctic continent at the southern limit of the flight, but no publicity would be given to the fact. Sir Hubert Wilkins stated his intention of returning in November 1929 to Deception Island in order to fly to the furthest point reached in 1928. From this advanced base he proposed to resume his flight along the coastline of the mainland towards the Ross Sea and to end his flight at Admiral Byrd's base in the Ross Sea Dependency. If possible, a landing would be made and some detailed geographical and scientific work done.

69. In May 1929 Sir Hubert Wilkins arrived in this country from America. He expressed his willingness to assist in establishing a British title to the sector between the Ross Sea and the Falkland Islands Dependencies. In view of the fact, however, that his funds were almost solely derived from American sources, he felt that his personal position would be somewhat embarrassing unless the British Government made a contribution, and he asked for financial assistance towards the cost of his expedition. His request was acceded to on certain conditions, and a sum of £7,500 has so far been paid by the Colonial Office from the Falkland Islands Research and Development Fund.

70. In order to invest Sir Hubert Wilkins with the necessary authority, it was decided to grant him a Royal Commission in the same form as that given to Sir Douglas Mawson. The commission authorised him, or any person designated by him, to take formal possession of any territories now unknown which he might discover between the Ross Sea and the Falkland Islands Dependencies. The commission was handed to him on the 15th October, 1929, at Montevideo, whilst he was on his way south.

71. Sir H. Wilkins unfortunately encountered adverse weather conditions, and was forced to abandon his intention of flying from the Falkland Islands Dependencies westward over the unexplored sector to the Ross Sea. He was, however, able to make several short-distance flights, of which the most successful were (1) from

59. Further discussions took place, the upshot of which was that it was decided in January 1929 to send the "Discovery" expedition, under the command of Sir Douglas Mawson, on the following terms: Australia to bear the cost of the expedition for 1929-30 and for the following year, if it lasted two years; the United Kingdom to arrange with the Government of the Falkland Islands for the "Discovery" to be placed at the disposal of the Commonwealth Government for the Antarctic seasons of 1929-30 and 1930-31 (at a cost to the Treasury of £8,000 per annum); New Zealand to contribute £2,500.

60. The objects of Sir Douglas Mawson's expedition were, briefly, to operate principally in the sector between Enderby Land and the Ross Sea (the Australian sector) with a view to completing the geographical and scientific work previously carried out in this sector by Sir Douglas Mawson himself and other British explorers and so to lead up to the final establishment of a British title to the whole sector, with the exception of the French territory of Adélie Land. In order that Sir Douglas Mawson should be provided with the necessary authority to take possession in the name of His Majesty of the territories in question, His Majesty granted to Sir Douglas a formal commission of authority for the purpose.

61. The commission empowered Sir Douglas Mawson, or any person duly authorised by him, to take formal possession of "such territories now unknown as may be discovered in the course of the aforesaid expedition and, further, of certain territories not under the sovereignty of any other State which have been discovered in the past by subjects of Our Royal Predecessors or of Ourselves, to wit: (i) The outlying part of Coats Land, viz., the portion not comprised within the Falkland Islands Dependencies; (ii) Enderby Land; (iii) Kemp Land; (iv) Queen Mary Land; (v) the area which lies to the west of Adélie Land, and which, on its discovery by the Australian Antarctic Expedition in 1912, was denominated Wilkes Land; (vi) King George V Land; (vii) Oates Land." It will be observed that the commission covered all the areas outside the Falkland Islands Dependencies which were specified in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings, as well as any new territories which might be discovered.

62. The "Discovery" sailed from London on the 1st August, 1929, and His Majesty's representative at Oslo was authorised, if approached on the subject by the Norwegian Government, to say that the scientific and exploratory expedition of the "Discovery" had been organised under the auspices of His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia, and that New Zealand and Great Britain were associating themselves in the enterprise by means of a financial contribution and the loan of the "Discovery" respectively. The French Government were informed of the despatch of the expedition and asked to give facilities at Kerguelen Island.

63. The report of Sir Douglas Mawson's Expedition, 1929-30, shows that, notwithstanding very adverse weather conditions encountered, it was singularly successful. Roughly, 700 miles of coast line eastwards of Enderby Land, immediately north and south of the Antarctic Circle and between latitudes 45° and 73° E. of Greenwich, have been explored and definitely established on the map for the first time. Enderby Land and Kemp Land have been linked up and proved to be part of one land mass, while new land was discovered to the east and named "MacRobertson Land." The work of this expedition was carried out within the limits of the proposed Dependency of Australia, and it is interesting to note that when on the 14th January, 1930, the "Discovery" encountered the Norwegian exploring vessel "Norvegia," in approximately longitude 47° E., they persuaded the Norwegians to turn about and to "confine their efforts to the west of the 40th meridian east of Greenwich, conditionally on our (Sir Douglas Mawson's Expedition) limiting ourselves to the east of that datum. The meeting came to an end, and we parted on friendly terms. Next day the Norwegians turned about and steamed past us to the west."

64. A new whaling ground was discovered off Enderby Land, and the information was passed on to a South African whaling vessel, which was able to take advantage of the discovery. The general result of the discoveries is that the Antarctic continent has been either charted or its location approximately indicated through 28° of longitude, between 45° E. and 73° E. of Greenwich. Evidence deduced indicates that this land is a portion of the great continental mass which occupies the major portion of the Antarctic regions. The land seen and charted includes the new area designated MacRobertson Land, together with the lands

"Whereas the Department of State has not defined a policy for the United States regarding American discoveries and explorations in the Antarctic, but has declared that, 'in the absence of an Act of Congress,' it 'would be reluctant to declare that the United States possessed a right of sovereignty over that territory'; therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the Senate of the United States does hereby authorise and direct the President to lay claim to all areas in the Antarctic which have been discovered or explored by American citizens."

On the 2nd July, 1930, the State Department issued to the press an analysis of the various national claims to sovereignty in the Antarctic which is, on the whole, quite comprehensive and impartial, and in which the minor expeditions of Palmer and Wilkes compare unfavourably with the work of such British explorers as Ross, Scott, Shackleton, Mawson and Wilkins. As regards Admiral Byrd's discoveries, the following quotation is of interest:—

"Closely associated with the results of the discoveries in their purely physical aspects are political consequences bearing upon the distribution of national interests within the whole Antarctic area. For example, Marie Byrd Land, previously claimed for the United States, but complicated because of the assumption that it was without access except through territory claimed by the British Government, it has been found, as a matter of fact, does possess an independent coastal access outside the British area and east of the 150th meridian."

In regard to Senator Tydings's resolution, Mr. Stimson is reported in the press to have said:—

"I cannot understand Congressmen, who are anxious to abandon the Philippines, which are well peopled and with rich natural resources, turning next minute to push forward a United States claim to barren and unpopulated territory."

(9.) *Sir Douglas Mawson's Expedition.*

55. As stated above in paragraph 6, the Imperial Conference recommended that the more important regions in the Antarctic outside the Ross Sea and Falkland Islands Dependencies should be brought under British control in three stages. The first stage was carried out by the publication of a statement in the Imperial Conference Summary of Proceedings. The activities of foreign nations in recent years soon rendered it necessary to consider the question of undertaking the second stage.

56. On the 28th July, 1928, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia proposed that, in order to complete the second stage of the measures recommended by the Imperial Conference and to promote scientific investigations into the whaling and sealing industry, a joint British expedition to the Antarctic should be organised. He recommended that the ship "Discovery" should be utilised, that Sir Douglas Mawson, who led the Australian expedition to the Antarctic of 1911-14, should be in command, that Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand should contribute £7,500, £7,500 and £2,500 respectively, and that the balance should be raised by public appeal.

57. These proposals were carefully considered here, and the general conclusion was reached that, although there were many practical difficulties to be overcome, the need for the expedition was becoming acute and that, in the meantime, use might be made of a South African firm, the Kerguelen Sealing and Whaling Company (Limited), which was planning a whaling expedition to the Antarctic.

58. As a result of these discussions, a whaling licence was granted in October 1928 by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to the South African firm on condition that the British flag was planted as opportunity offered. It was realised, however, that, since the movements of a whaling expedition must be governed by commercial, rather than political, considerations, little reliance could be placed on this arrangement, and that the project of sending the "Discovery" could not be abandoned until every means of circumventing the obstacles in the way had been exhausted.

50. In April 1929 Sir E. Howard reported that the United States press was displaying considerable excitement over a note which the State Department was believed to be about to despatch in reply to the British note of the 17th November, 1928, which was described as amounting to a British claim to hegemony over the whole Antarctic. According to the press the United States Government intended to claim that all Wilkes Land is American by discovery and to make a counter claim respecting the Falkland Islands Dependencies, in which area lies Graham Land, which was first discovered by Captain Palmer, of the United States Navy, in 1820. The State Department was also said to be contemplating suggesting exchanging the British claim to Wilkes Land for the American claim in the Falkland Islands Dependencies. Sir E. Howard said that he proposed to make no communication to the United States Government until he received the threatened note from the State Department.

51. The note was never received, and reports from Washington justified the inference that there were two parties in the State Department, the first in favour of pushing American claims and the second advocating a more prudent policy. From what has since occurred it appears that the second party is in the ascendant for the moment. In this connexion it is of interest to mention that, so recently as 1924, the United States evinced so little interest in making claims in the Antarctic that Mr. Hughes, the Secretary of State, speaking of Wilkes Land, said: "In the absence of an act of Congress assertive of dominion over Wilkes Land, this department would be reluctant to declare that the United States possessed a right of sovereignty over that territory."

52. On the 15th November, 1929, the State Department addressed a note to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Washington expressing regret that, through an oversight, no reply had been made to the British note of the 17th November, 1928, and conveying the appreciation of the United States Government of the interest of His Majesty's Government in Admiral Byrd's expedition. The note went on to say:—

"The reference in the Ambassador's note to the Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1926 containing an account of discussions concerning certain regions of the Antarctic has been noted, but since it is assumed that this was merely brought to the Department's attention for its information, no comment by the Department would seem to be called for at this time."

53. The substance of the British note of the 17th November, 1928, and of the United States reply, was given to the United States press. The latter generally took the line that the reply of the State Department, whilst deferring the possibility of any controversy, was designed to leave the door open for further discussions. These, it was thought, would be initiated sooner or later in view of possible United States claims to Wilkes and Graham Lands and to the territories discovered by Admiral Byrd. The question of the possible application of the Monroe doctrine was also stated to be receiving consideration at the State Department.

54. Meanwhile, news was received from Washington of the great public interest aroused by the reports of Admiral Byrd's successful flight to the South Pole. A suitable message of congratulation was sent to the United States Government by the Secretary of State for Air. The fact that the American flag had been hoisted in the Antarctic over "Little America," as the base in the Ross Sea was called, and that American names, such as "Rockefeller" and "Charles Bob" Mountains and "Marie Byrd Land," had been placed on the map, and that the South Pole had been flown over for the first time in the course of Admiral Byrd's seventeen hours' flight on the 28th November, 1929, led a considerable part of the American public to regard these territories as theirs. On the 1st July, 1930, Senator Tydings of Maryland introduced in the Senate the following resolution, which attracted a great deal of publicity:—

"Whereas certain hitherto unknown areas of land in the South Polar region have been discovered and explored by Rear-Admiral Richard E. Byrd;

"Whereas the British Government has notified the Department of State that various areas in the Antarctic, which comprise almost the entire South Polar cap, are claimed as British territory;

"Whereas the regions claimed by Great Britain include two areas originally discovered by American naval officers as early as 1820 and 1840;