

on the stump in Massachusetts, appealed to popular prejudices by making certain statements with regard to the Alaskan boundary question. But he indignantly repudiates the idea that he is not impartial, that he is impervious to reasoning, that he cannot judge the case on its merits after having heard the evidence. I think it would be an aspersion on his character and that we would be entirely unwarranted in supposing this to be the case. I would just as soon trust the question to Senator Lodge as to a member of the United States Supreme Court. In fact I believe he would be more likely to take an impartial view of the case from the circumstances that as his character and his judgment and his methods have been impugned, he would be therefore more desirous to give a judicial and proper decision on the matter. The same language would apply to a large extent, if not to so great an extent, to Senator Turner of the Pacific coast. And as to Secretary Root, I am unable to understand how the slightest exception can be taken to his serving on the commission. The matter, so far as we are concerned, is in this shape. I presume we all desire to have this question eliminated from the great questions that promise difficulties and friction between the two countries. We have in our hands the choice of commissioners, and it should be our duty to select the very best men we have, as the leader of the opposition has said. We want to set the Americans the example of giving the best jurists we have in the British empire to sit on that commission.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why do not they set us an example?

Mr. CHARLTON. They do.

Mr. MACLEAN. When—in Canadian matters?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that we are in a position to dictate to the United States the course they should pursue or to give an opinion as to who is fit to sit on that commission or who is not. We are dealing with a nation of 80,000,000 people and we are but a nation of 5,000,000 to 6,000,000. Great Britain is anxious to maintain friendly relations with that people, and for us to say that these men are not satisfactory would defeat the consummation desired and put an end to all negotiations. We may regret that men not entirely acceptable to us were not appointed, but it is not for us to say who should be appointed, and we are deficient in the sense of proportion when we suppose that five million people can dictate to eighty million the course they should pursue. Whether we be satisfied with the commission or not, there are circumstances which, in the opinion of the United States, have rendered it proper and desirable and politic to appoint these men on that commission, and we are prejudging the case

when we assume that they are not fit to perform the functions and not capable of giving an impartial decision. I am sorry myself that the Supreme Court judges of the United States declined to act. I am sorry the commission is not one that suits our purposes and desires, but it is a matter for the United States to select their own commissioners to attempt to adjust, and I hope and anticipate a favourable and satisfactory result from the appointment of this commission.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition quoted to us this afternoon a large number of extracts from American papers with regard to the character of the commission and the views entertained by the commissioners. Well, I do not attach a very great degree of importance to extracts from American, or Canadian newspapers either, for that matter. Editors, sitting in their sanctums, write with an air of supreme wisdom and authority, but they are often very much mistaken, and I look at the matter from a broader standpoint than the opinion of editor this or that, or any other scribbler in an editorial sanctum, who prejudices the case himself and imagines he knows all about it. Of course I do not intend any reflections on any editor present. Present company is always excepted. But what I say is that these quotations from American newspapers are entirely unreliable and not worthy of consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN. How does the hon. gentleman prove that there is a better feeling in the United States towards Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a self evident fact.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the press, I suppose?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that Canadian papers, even the one managed by my hon. friend opposite, are an exception to the rule. I notice often a tone which I greatly regret—very flippant, cynical and unfair—with regard to things American, which does not elevate the paper in my opinion and certainly does not tend to create good feeling. And that thing, to some extent, has existed in the United States. The tone of the Canadian newspapers I know, produces irritation, and those who desire better relations between the two countries look upon this matter with regret. And I can say, Sir,—and I think that perhaps no person in this House is better able to give an opinion on the subject than myself—that the sentiment in the United States towards Canada is rapidly growing more friendly, and that their ideas as to the relation between these countries have grown broader and more correct during the last three years than they were before, that the knowledge of Canada, the absence of which gave them false ideas, as to the relations of the countries previous to that time is growing. And I believe it is to our in-