

men—because they believe that prior occupation entitled Russia to more than the United States has claimed ; and the latter, because they were certain they would obtain far more than either party to the Treaty had expected or intended.

The United States, from the inception of the Ukase of 1821, appear to have so developed their interests upon the north-west coast of the continent, that Canadians have relieved them of the onus and risk of duplicating the Maine Boundary *expansion* on a more gigantic scale. It is King's Counsel, who before the Tribunal, to the damage of their own contentions regarding the heads of the inlets, go out of their way to disclaim any British rights upon the islands ; and proving with elaborate care that the Ocean of the Treaty—like a crop-headed Samson in the arms of the Philistine—lapps languidly amongst the channels of the “inland sea,” that by the terms of delimitation is exclusively British. One even states :—“The fallacy of the argument that there was no ocean inside the islands rested on the omission to consider the position of these waters before the treaty, when Russia had not the undisputed ownership of the mainland as well as of the islands.”—

Can this learned profession imagine it is they, who, in any sense set a limit to the Ocean, or that it is bounded by the treaties of nations that in comparison have but an ephemeral and insecure existence along its margin ? Such assertions—they cannot be called arguments—made by United States counsel, if they did not defeat their object would certainly have provoked a strenuous and perhaps successful opposition ; used by Canadians the result was unavoidable.

From *The Times* reports of the addresses of U. S. counsel, it is not impossible to glean some arguments that appear to favour British rights rather than the opposing claims in support of which they are advanced. Mr. Hannis Taylor, suggests that Britain “sought to regard the treaty as the starting point for a fresh controversy, and to reduce it to a mere nullity.” (“You'r another !” is often a very effective argument—failing a better.) “Portland Channel, as claimed by the United States, was broad and navigable, that of Great Britain was tortuous and useless. Great