

admission, on behalf of the United States, of "the spirit, intent and meaning" of this Treaty:—

It will be observed that Article III expressly delimits the boundary between British America and the Russian possessions. The delimitation is in minute detail from 54° 40' to the northern terminus of the coast. The evident design of Article IV was to make certain and definite the boundary line along the strip of coast, should there be any doubt as to that line as laid down in Article III. It provided that the boundary line, following the windings of the coast, should never be more than ten marine leagues therefrom.

And his commentary on Article VI supports the British claim:—

Nothing is clearer than the reason for this. A strip of land, at no point wider than ten marine leagues running along the Pacific Ocean, from 54° 40' to 60°, was assigned to Russia by the third article. Directly to the east of this strip of land, or as it might be said, behind it, lay the British possessions. To shut out the inhabitants of the British possessions from the sea by this strip of land, would have been not only unreasonable, but intolerable, to Great Britain. Russia promptly conceded the privilege, and gave to Great Britain the right of navigating all rivers crossing that strip of land from 54° 40' to the point of intersection with the 141st degree of longitude. Without this concession the Treaty could not have been made. It is the same strip of land which the United States acquired in the purchase of Alaska; the same strip of land which gave to British-America, lying behind it, a free access to the Ocean.

Senator Sumner, in the debate on the Alaska Treaty of 1867, described it as "a margin of the mainland, fronting on the Ocean, 30 miles broad and 300 miles long, to Mount St. Elias." And Senator Washburn admitted that Great Britain had a Treaty with Russia, "giving her subjects, for ever, the free navigation of the rivers of Russian-America."

The recent contention of the United States, as stated in the National Geographic Magazine by Mr. Ex-Secretary Foster, is that "Russia was to have a continuous strip of territory on the mainland around all the inlets or arms of the sea;" and that the boundary line was not to cross, as claimed by Great Britain, such inlets or arms of the sea at the distance of 10 marine leagues from the coast-line of the Pacific Ocean. And he supports his contention by the argument *ab inconvenienti*, that—

The purpose for which the strip was established would be defeated if it was to be broken in any part of its course by inlets, or arms of the sea, extending into British territory. With the strip of territory so established, all the interior waters of the Ocean, above its southern limit, became Russian, and were to be inaccessible to British ships and traders, except by express license.