

that the shores of Portland Channel or Lynn Canal are parts of the coast line of the continent of America.

For the reasons before stated, the great contest of the Russians was to procure a strip of land along the continental line. But it was never the intention and there was nothing said about the strip going around the fiords or inlets passing beyond the strip which was fixed at a width of ten leagues from the coast or "ocean," as stated in article four.

It was a great oversight that there was no map accompanying the treaty. If there had been, much disputation would have been saved. It is not wise now to attach too much importance to maps or to what may have been done by interested parties during the forty-two years between the making of the treaty and the American purchase.

The question is, What does the treaty contain, and with a liberal construction, what did the treaty makers intend it to contain?

If arbitration is to be respected, the Venezuelan submission is a precedent created by Mr. Cleveland, a precedent created by the United States, and should be followed, especially as that particular case was in a manner forced upon the British. It was a plausible suggestion, and it was alleged by both the American and English people that this was the only fair way of settling a boundary question. It may be added that the English in the best of good faith followed up that example of popular opinion by enacting a general law for the establishment of arbitration between the two countries, but when that law came for approval to America it was rejected by the United States Senate.

When the Spanish war was over, the first thing that very naturally occurred to American statesmen was the great necessity for having the much-talked of canal built from the Atlantic to the Pacific at some point in Central America. This could be accomplished, but it would require time and large capital. In addition to this there stood in the way the Bulwer-Clayton Treaty made in 1850 whereby it was agreed between England and America that no such canal should be built unless it should be neutral between the two nations. It then occurred to the statesmen at Washington that it would be well to ask England if she would be willing to repeal the treaty. It was a surprise to English statesmen, but in view of the altered circumstances arising out of such large American interests in the Pacific, it was stated in the press that England had given the subject a most favorable consideration. Yet before anything was closed some of the American press exclaimed against the matter not being carried out more quickly, and alleged that it was being