

essfully considered. For while I do not at all say that I have made an accurate division of various treaties, this, broadly, is the result: Of matters which were peculiarly pecuniary, there were five submitted—two arbitrations were wholly successful and three were not successful. Of matters which were not simply pecuniary, but involved territory or something of that kind, ten were submitted to commissioners—eight arbitrations were wholly successful and two not successful. There were four references to sovereigns, three of which were successful. Therefore, of the nineteen references, thirteen were wholly successful and only six have failed: and this I venture to say is an admirable showing.

How do we now stand? There are three main agreements, the Treaty of 1908 (of which I have already spoken), another of 1909 (the Waterways Treaty of much the same character), and the Rush-Bagot Convention of 1817.

The Waterways Treaty was signed January 11th, 1909; it provides for the establishment and maintenance of an International Joint Commission of the United States and Canada—three appointed by each government—which commission should (Article VIII) have jurisdiction over and pass upon all cases involving the use, obstruction or diversion of the waters between the United States and Canada. Article IX contains an agreement that all matters of difference between the countries involving the rights, obligations or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other along the frontier, shall be referred to this commission for inquiry and report. Article X provides that any question or matter of difference involving the rights, obligations or interests of the United States or of Canada, either in relation to each other or to their respective inhabitants, may be referred for decision to this International Joint Commission. If the commission be equally divided an umpire is to be chosen in the man-