

“again the United States got the better of England, and has a “boundary within sight of Victoria.” It would have been interesting to have learned from Mr. Ramsay the grounds on which Great Britain, after agreeing to a treaty fixing the 49th parallel of latitude as the international boundary, could sustain its claim to the possession of the Island of San Juan, which is situated considerably to the south of that latitude. The portion of Vancouver Island south of the 49th parallel was conceded, solely because it would have been inconvenient to have had such an island under two different Governments, but no such ground existed in the case of San Juan; and, as Mr. Ramsay calls attention to the fact that “the boundary is within sight of Victoria,” I must infer that he considers that, by selecting that site for the capital of British Columbia, Great Britain established a claim to a territory which is clearly within the established boundaries of the United States. I cannot dispute Mr. Ramsay’s assertion that “with regard to each treaty, the Canadian feeling has been that on each England was too yielding,” but I cannot agree with him that “the value of the territory was not appreciated, and her diplomatists were outmanœuvred on every occasion.” My own belief is that all of the treaties referred to were negotiated in a fair spirit by statesmen, anxious to settle disputes, regarding which each believed in the justice of the claim of his own nation, while all were desirous to avoid an appeal to arms, which would have been specially disastrous to Canada, and which would not have promoted the final settlement of the questions in controversy. Mr. Ramsay refers very briefly to the treaty of Washington in 1871, in the following terms:—“The celebrated Alabama claims, which were paid “for by England on such a liberal scale, and the Canadian Fenian “claim, which was tossed aside so lightly at Washington in 1871.” It is to be inferred that Mr. Ramsay is of opinion that the Treaty of Washington in 1871 is another instance of Great Britain being outmanœuvred by the United States. I am wholly unable to concur in that opinion. After protracted negotiations on the subject of claims made by the United States, on the ground of Great Britain’s violation of neutrality, the whole subject was referred to arbitration, it being understood by Great Britain that the United States had abandoned its claim for consequential damages, founded on the Queen’s proclamation of belligerency. A fairer mode of settling the dispute could not have been devised. When the Arbitrators met, the consequential claims, a portion of which were estimated by the Hon. Charles Sumner at \$110,000,000 were pre-