

that most unfair and most unjust impediment to our trade? Nothing. No result. It seems to me that our friends might have availed themselves of the opportunity of that conference to urge upon the government of Great Britain some scheme, some plan, by which a great dependency, such as our own, might have had additional facilities, additional means of approaching to the sovereign power when it is a question of concluding commercial treaties in which this country is interested. Nothing in that regard. As regards the Alaskan boundary treaty with which my right hon. friend is so perfectly satisfied, I listened vainly to hear my right hon. friend make a distinct statement as to whether his government recommended that form of settlement of the difficulty or whether they did not do so. Do they recommend it? Have they taken any steps to secure upon that tribunal, or commission, or arbitration board, or whatever it may be called, the presence of two jurists at least from our own country, and what steps have they taken to secure that end, if any? For my own part, Sir, what I respectfully submit to this House in regard to that most important matter is this: It may be that the tract of land as to which the dispute exists is not of very great value, but as far as I have been able to understand the very able arguments uttered and printed in favour of the Canadian contention, we are greatly interested in securing some of those bays which extend into the disputed territory as an outlet to the sea from that great Yukon territory which is known to be so valuable. Now, Sir, do my hon. friends think that, with such a commission as has been named and with, as is intimated to us, the presence upon that commission of two men who may be very estimable American citizens, but who are no doubt one-sided upon this question, they have taken every measure or precaution to protect our interests? The right hon. leader of the government laid great stress upon the fact that in respect to the proposal that when they submitted the Venezuelan difficulty there was a stipulation that the position occupied by those whose interests were adverse to our own would not be sacrificed in any event, and that by his efforts they had secured in the present treaty the obliteration of that obnoxious clause, but, how are we to couple that great claim made by the right hon. gentleman with the statement he made when he touched upon this subject that this commission was a commission of legal men named in order to determine where the limits were? I ask this House whether if that, being the nature of a commission, it would have been very dignified for us to allow a stipulation to be made in the treaty that whatever might be the finding of the investigating commission, Skagway and such other ports as are at present in the hands of our American neighbours should under all circumstances remain therein. It

seems to me that the claim that they have secured a great advantage for us is not one which this House will readily accept, but, what I am anxious to see, Mr. Speaker, is some proof of the steps taken by this government at the time of the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and also when this present treaty was under negotiation, to secure full protection to our rights. I moved, if my memory serves me right, last year, for the production of the correspondence that had taken place between this government and the imperial government in regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and I think I am right in saying that the motion was denied me. When the correspondence relating to that treaty, in which, perhaps, as my hon. friend at my right (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says, we have no practical interest, but, which may have been used as a powerful lever to help a useful solution of the Alaskan boundary difficulty, when the correspondence which will be brought down, as has been promised to my hon. friend, and when further correspondence in relation to this treaty is before us, we will be in a better position to see exactly what steps have been taken to secure our rights in that most important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I confess to some astonishment at the announcement made by the right hon. leader of the government that nothing has yet been determined by the government and that there is nothing which the government can lay before this House in regard to the additional facilities for transportation across the continent which are referred to in a dim and indefinite way in the speech from the Throne. I think I am not mistaken in stating that it is over three months ago that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) intimated to the public that some scheme was under consideration, and it was viewed favourably by himself, to give us a new route across the continent. Since that time we have had discussions galore throughout the press in this country. We have seen the head men of the two great railways existing in this country discussing publicly under what conditions these additional facilities are to be given to the country, and I think it is a fair matter of regret for us to see when we are summoned together that the government of this country, at this present moment, with a prospect of a long session before us has determined nothing definite whatever in regard to these additional facilities and cannot say when the commission, which is referred to in the speech from the Throne, will make its report, or whether the government will wait for the report or not, before it lays a definite scheme before parliament.

My right hon. friend closed his remarks by referring to the necessity of remedying an injustice in respect to the distribution of seats which took place years ago. As a proof of that injustice, he spoke of some