Statement.

Mr. MacLane's letter. On the contrary, it is evident, from Mr. Pakenham's despatch of the 29th July, 1846, that the letter was unknown to him till its unauthorized publication, as mentioned in that despatch.\* Nor did Mr. Buchanan in any manner inform Mr. Pakenham of Mr. MacLane's view. In a Memorandum, † written in 1858, Sir Richard (formerly Mr.) Pakenham, states that Mr. Puchanan on the occasion of the Treaty "made no mention whatever of the Canal de Haro as that through which the line of boundary should run as understood by the United States Government." If, indeed, Mr. Buchanan had done so, that mere fact would be of no importance as against Her Majesty's Government. Mr. Pakenham was acting under strict instructions. If Mr. Buchanan had indicated the Canal de Haro as the boundary channel, Mr. Pakenham could only have answered as he did on the question of the effect of Article II, namely, —the Article speaks for itself.‡ He had no power to modify the project of Treaty in substance, and no power to bind his Government by assenting to or acquiescing in an interpretation which would have been equivalent to a serious modification.

- 20. It appears to Her Majesty's Government that this examination of Mr. MacLane's letter justifies them in submitting to the Arbitrator that the letter affords no support to the contention of the United States.
- 21. In addition to Mr. MacLane's letter, Mr. Bancroft refers to the speech of Mr. Benton in the Senate before mentioned. The passage in Mr. Bancroft's Memorial is as follows (page 19):—
- "A suspicion of ambiguity could not lurk in the mind of any one. Mr. Benton found the language so clear that he adopted it as his own. In his Speech in the Senate on the day of the ratification of the Treaty, he said:—
- "The first Article of the Treaty is in the very words which 1 myself would have used if the two Governments had left it to me to draw the boundary line between them
- 22. Her Majesty's Government submit that the speech of Mr. Benton is even of less value, as evidence in support of the centention of the United States, than is Mr. MacLane's letter.
- (i.) It seems probable that Mr. Benton founded his exposition of the draft Treaty on Mr. MacLane's letter, § extracts from which had been communicate? 'ver the President of the United States to the Senate. If so, Mr. Benton's interpretation is only a reflection of Mr. MacLane's.
- (ii.) Mr. Benton may indeed have formed his opinion not directly on Mr. MacLane's letter, but on the same sort of ground on which it would appear Mr. MacLane's statement was made, namely, a knowledge (whether complete, or accurate, or not) of the local conditions. In that case his statement would amount to no more than a declaration of

his opir would r construct discussion de Haro

(iii
title the
through
occasion
tion of t

23. goes so

" The Secretary parollel o

Wi

Senate advisers no infor Mr. Buc because respecti has been the dra mention been se speak) substan whether not com Her Ma savs :-

"It yet that should ri

from Lo
of the
in Mr.
erroneo

25 regarde

<sup>·</sup> Historical Note, p. xx.

<sup>†</sup> Inclosed in Lord John Russell's despatch to Lord Lyons, 24th August, 1859; read, and copy given to United States' Secretary of State. Appendix, No. 1.

<sup>#</sup> Historical Note, p. xx.

<sup>§</sup> This was Sir Riebard Pakenham's view, as expressed in his Memorandum, Appendix, No. 1.

If Mr. Cass describes Mr. Benton as being "better orquainted, perhaps, than any other member [of the Senate] with the geography of the region in dispute."—To Mr. Dallas, 20th October, 1859; read, and copy given, to Her Maiesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affirs.

<sup>\*</sup> P

<sup>†</sup> M for Forei ‡ 11

<sup>[3</sup>