

assumes must have been known to be without the limits of the Treaty.

An influential part of the English press concedes that the American position is tenable. The "Times" and the "Pall Mall Gazette," each has repeatedly insisted upon this. Even the "Daily News" says:—"It is admitted that the terms employed have a regrettable ambiguity." Lord Cairns, Lord Derby, and other statesmen have, with equal candor, assented to this.

On the other hand, I take it that reasonable Americans will concede with equal fairness that there is much to be said in favour of the British construction of the Treaty and Protocols. It is plain, therefore, on this assumption that a misunderstanding exists between the governments which can only be decided either by mutual agreement or by a reference to the language of the Treaty, before an influential tribunal.

Now, as to the first mode of settlement, reflecting persons cannot fail to see that after the irritating, and I think I may say, ill-judged (if a peaceful solution be the object), language of the London press, it is absolutely impossible for the American Government to concede that it has been mistaken. Lest, however, I should be misunderstood, I ought to add, that in the judgment of all the Americans whom I have met, as well as in my own judgment, our government is right and ought not to retract until a competent tribunal decides that it is wrong; and I may further say, that the assent of two-thirds of the Senate having been

giv
can
pra
inst
tha
cou
] fere
the
of t
col
gov
I
ther
I
just
such
so
reas
bey
dis
N
in s
Stat
as t
Gov
sam
jesty
Stat
Ger