

SAN JUAN, ALASKA,

AND

THE NORTH-WEST BOUNDARY.

WHILE fully accepting the settlement of the San Juan question as irrevocable, I am induced to endeavour to clear up, in as few words as possible, the misconceptions by which the case is still surrounded.

If apology were needed for reviving the subject at all, it must be borne in mind that we are not yet out of the wood, either in regard to the Haro Strait or the land and water boundary between our territories and Alaska, where precisely similar difficulties present themselves, subject to the same differences of interpretation.

Some vindication of our national character in the eyes of the world is also imperatively demanded; standing convicted, as we do, of having so long and persistently asserted a claim which has been authoritatively decided against us, while it is but little known that the basis of our contention had been expressly excluded from the arbitration.

Our experience in this, as in other questions, revives the consideration of how far, and under what circumstances, it may be practicable, on the part of the Executive, to consult Parliament before committing the country to Treaties or Conventions. In this instance, our representatives consented to nullify a Treaty,