

fore we go into that question, that, provided the arbitrators decide that if we are in possession of Canadian territory, we shall not be required to give it up, but continue to hold it. That is point the first. Point the second is : We do not intend that there shall be any settlement of this Alaskan boundary question at all. Why, Sir, no person ever made so monstrous a proposition as that there should be an equal number on each side, and no umpire, to decide a question of that kind. The question of an international boundary is a question that is perfectly understood in the comity of nations. It is a question that depends on the construction of the treaty under which that boundary is fixed ; and when two governments are unable to agree as to the significance of the terms of that treaty in such a way as to settle the boundary, then, according to all practice, such a question should be solved by a reference to an international tribunal, by calling in experts and by calling in an umpire of an international character to decide what shall be done. Why, Sir, what was done in the case of the north-western boundary of the United States ? Suppose that England, instead of doing what every nation does under such circumstances, had said : We will not have any arbitration ; we will not refer to any third party or to any international tribunal the question as to whether the Island of San Juan is in British or in American territory ; it is in our possession to-day ; we are occupying it, as we have done for many years, and we require, before going into any arbitration, that if the tribunal decides that that island is in United States territory, we shall not be obliged to abandon it, but will continue to hold it. Every person knows that so monstrous a proposition would have been rejected with scorn by the United States of America. That question was referred to an international tribunal, and that tribunal decided that the Island of San Juan was in American territory ; and although England was in possession of that island then, and had been for many years, it was handed over to the United States, and the channel on the Canadian side of the island was made the boundary line. Now, Sir, if the statement be true that has been given to us to-day by the mover of the Address—and we have no reason to doubt its truth—that the representatives of the Government of Canada determined that there should be no settlement of any question without that boundary question being settled, what position will you be in on the second day of August to meet at Quebec, unless in the meantime that question is settled by a diplomatic arrangement between the two countries ? I hold, therefore, that in the interests of Canada, and upon every principle of international law by which such questions are governed, it was the duty of the representatives of the Crown to take the stand there and then that there would be no further negotiations upon those questions, if

that question was not disposed of before the tribunal met ; and I assume that will be the case. Now, Sir, what has been done ? We have had six months' long negotiations, we have had the American press and the Canadian press teeming with what was being done, first at Quebec, and subsequently at Washington. Where are we now ? Why, Sir, everybody knows that there became a burning desire on the part of the people of Canada that those negotiations should be brought to a termination, and that the representatives of Canada should return to their own country ; that if it was found impossible to induce the United States to agree to a fair and just solution of these various questions, the matter should be terminated, and Canada should be left in a position to take such measures as, I do not hesitate to say, are absolutely essential to command that respect on the part of that great republic that lies at the very foundation of securing any just consideration for any Canadian question. We have tried the sunny ways, we have tried the plauistic means of accomplishing these objects, too long, and we have tried them with such a thoroughly bootless result that the patience of the people of Canada is exhausted, and they say : Let us now—not retaliate ; no person talks of retaliation. No person raises the question of retaliation for a single moment ; but we say the time has come when it is absolutely due to Canadian interests that the world should know that we are not in the humiliating and dependent position of being obliged to crave as suppliants at the feet of the United States of America any consideration whatever. We say that Canada has attained that position, and she enjoys that position to-day. Consider her attitude in whatever light and from whatever standpoint you may, we say that Canada occupies a position in which she asks no favour from the United States of America or from any other foreign country. Canada is so magnificently endowed by nature with such rich and inexhaustible resources of every kind and character as to make it unnecessary for her ; and if it was necessary, no policy is more fatal to attain the object in view than to present ourselves in the position of suppliants. Now, Sir, those deliberations, in my judgment, should have been closed the moment the United States took so unreasonable a position as they did, according to the official report given out by the Hon. Senator Fairbanks and the Prime Minister of Canada, acting as the head of the commission. I say, the moment that point was reached, those negotiations should have been closed, and the representatives of Canada should have returned to their seats in this House of Commons of our country, in a position to take up those questions and deal with them, not in a spirit of retaliation, but in a spirit of adopting just such legislation as the interests of Canada demanded at their hands. A great deal of difficulty that has grown