

titude took place with the consent and concurrence of the government of Canada. I would not have brought myself to believe that the Canadian government had concurred, if it had not been for the language of my right hon. friend speaking for his government, which seemed to indicate that in his opinion Canada had no direct interest in the abrogation of the treaty or in the Nicaraguan canal. It may be that this government has concurred in the abrogation of that treaty without provision for the delimitation of the Alaskan boundary. All I can say is that, if the government has taken that attitude, I believe it merits the censure and condemnation of every true-hearted and loyal Canadian for so doing.

What is the position of affairs? The position is that Great Britain has made a treaty with the United States of America for the submission to six impartial jurists of the question of the position of the Alaskan frontier; three of these impartial jurists to be appointed by Great Britain and three to be appointed by the United States. Well, does my right hon. friend, or does his government, expect that there will be a verdict either one way or the other from a majority of these impartial jurists? What was the idea of the government on that point when it consented to this treaty? For I suppose that this treaty, which affects the boundary of Canada, was not made without the consent of the Canadian government. It is true it does not contain the provisions of the Washington treaty which make it necessary that it should be submitted to the parliament of Canada before it comes into force. Probably my right hon. friend will explain why that provision was not contained in the treaty which has just been made between Great Britain and the United States. The government have seen fit to make this treaty—it was made by the imperial government presumably with the concurrence of the Canadian government—but it is made without any reference to the parliament of Canada, and this parliament is helpless to touch the question one way or the other now that the treaty has been made.

Well, we have these impartial jurists to deal with this matter. And does my right hon. friend feel satisfied with the selection which has been made by the United States of America? It seems to me that the situation is rather an extraordinary one. I do not know, personally, anything about the three gentlemen who have been selected by the government of the United States; but I have a number of quotations from leading journals of that country which point out the fact that these gentlemen have, or at least two of them, prejudged the case. For example, the *Detroit 'Tribune'* says that the subsidence of opposition to the Alaskan treaty in the Senate is explained by the fact that word was

secretly passed around who the American members of the commission would be, and the announcement of the names was a sufficient guarantee that, no matter what the Canadian case was, there was not the least danger that Uncle Sam would lose anything. This newspaper, the *Detroit 'Tribune'* also says:

It may be assumed without the slightest hesitation that the convictions of these two gentlemen—(Lodge and Turner)—have been formed in advance and irrevocably. . . . If Secretary Root were to show any disposition to weaken or compromise they would doubtless break up the conference in a row before anything could be lost or gained.

That is the view which an important journal in the United States takes of the situation. Now, one of these gentlemen, Senator Lodge, a very prominent gentleman in the United States, is quoted in a public journal as having spoken as follows:

The negotiations failed because Canada made claims in regard to the Alaskan boundary which the United States could not accept and which no nation with an ounce of self respect could have admitted. . . . In 1867 we bought Alaska and the Russian title vested in us. For seventy years, in round numbers, that title was never questioned. Then gold was discovered. Then England set up a claim in complete contradiction to the treaty of 1825 which had been recognized for seventy years, and a more manufactured and baseless claim was never set up. If we should yield to it there is not a portion of our northern boundary which England could not attack. . . . When an attempt was made to revive negotiations last spring, Canada came forward again with her Alaskan claim and President Roosevelt refused to recognize it, as any patriotic American would. . . . No nation can afford to surrender its territory on baseless claims.

Does my right hon. friend regard that as the language of an 'impartial jurist' about to pass on this question between Canada and the United States? Then the *Minneapolis 'Tribune'*, another leading journal of the United States, said:

Secretary Root and Senator Lodge are men of high character, but they are not exactly the eminent and impartial jurists contemplated by the treaty. Besides they are connected with the government in such a way as almost inevitably to make them strong partisans of its case. Senator Turner is not even a man of high public character. . . . Besides as a border senator, he is committed to the most extreme American interpretation.

And the *Brooklyn 'Eagle'*, in the forcible language which is sometimes found even in leading American journals expresses its view in this way:

The chances of convincing American jurists of the rightfulness of Canada's claims are about the same as the prospects of a thaw in Hades.

The *New York 'Commercial Advertiser'* says:

Secretary Root and Senator Lodge have been stubborn in believing that Great Britain has