

the United States and Canada. Those propositions were brushed aside as not worthy of consideration. Afterwards, when a change of government took place in 1873, the government, of which I had the honour of being a member, felt that it was quite important that there should be a delimitation of that boundary. A prisoner was being taken through that territory, a man named Martin, and bringing him down one of the rivers, he refused to go with the officers in charge. Some resistance took place and finally he made an application, after being brought to our territory, to the United States authorities. They insisted that he was in the United States territory when he desired to escape, and so he had to be given up. Propositions were then made, and it was pointed out how important it was, to define the boundary. Either in that year, or a year or two before, President Grant was so impressed with the importance of delimiting that boundary that, at the instance of the then Secretary of State at Washington, a paragraph was put in the address to Congress pointing out the importance of appointing a commission to define the boundary between Alaska and the British territory. Congress declined on the ground they would not pay their share of the expense. They recognized that it ought to be done, but would not go to the expense, so little value was attached to the new domain acquired by the United States. I make this observation to show how entirely wrong the press of the United States has been in educating their people into the belief that Canada had never set up any claim to any other part of the country than that which they thought Canada was entitled to—that is, ten marine leagues from the heads of the inlets. They entirely ignored the range of mountains that was to form the natural boundary. It was only in the absence of the mountains that the ten marine leagues was to be considered. It was under these conditions and the absolute necessity of settling this question that a commission was decided upon, because if gold were found now in what is known as the provisional district, that is the district which both parties are claiming, we all know what the result would be. The United States miners would flood the country and take possession, and it would be

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

theirs. We know the mother country would never disturb them. It would never be a *casus belli* with them, and it is our interest, wherever the boundary may be found, to settle it now. We of course could not cordially approve of the method agreed upon. Our desire all along was to adopt the policy observed by all nations of referring a question of that kind to arbitration, with an umpire who would decide in the event of the two parties not agreeing. That seems impossible. The United States would not consent to it, and therefore, whether anything will come of this commission, of course it is impossible to say. It is, however, possible that such evidence may be evolved in the examination as will induce a better feeling either on the part of the United States or of Canada, to recognize where the weight of the evidence lies, and in that way a finality may be reached; but that is only one of the possibilities. I need not comment on the unfairness of the United States declining to follow the ordinary method adopted by friendly nations. We know with what pertinacity the United States urged arbitration of the Venezuela question. No matter what the dispute was, they maintained there was one way between friendly nations to settle questions of that kind; still, when Canada was a claimant, they declined to apply the principle which has prevailed elsewhere and which would be applied in this case in the event of a stronger nation than Canada being the contestant. I do not desire now to make any comments on the commissioners named by the United States, Senators Lodge and Turner. To Mr. Root, I conceive there would be no objection. He is a member of the government, it is true; still I understand he is about to retire. As I said before, we had to take that or nothing, and I do not hesitate to say that unless Senator Lodge and Senator Turner had been named, the Senate would not have approved the treaty. It may be a bold statement to make, but any one who has followed events could come to no other conclusion. When the British minister at Washington announced that he had succeeded in enlisting the friendly attention of the United States to obtain a treaty, we were of course very much pleased. It then became known there would be, not an arbitration, but a judicial