

had between the two governments in order that that herd might be preserved. That was a subject of irritation on one side if not on both, and so it became necessary to come to a more perfect understanding with our neighbours in respect to that. Then there was the dispute to which my hon. friend has referred, this question of boundary: and the United States contend the boundary is, where we think it is not. In our opinion, under the convention with Russia of 1825, the convention of St. Petersburg, the location of the boundary is not where the United States contend it is. In our opinion the proper location would give us, at all events, the upper portion of the Lynn Canal, and if our contention is right Dyea and Skagway are located in Canadian territory. Now, let me say this: my hon. friend has referred to some other matters connected with this which I will discuss later. He has referred to the communications which took place on this subject. We thought, and we think still, that the rule which the United States urged on behalf of Venezuela and which the British Government at their instance accepted, is one equally applicable to the disputed boundary between the United States and Canada. The United States insisted, when the boundary came to be settled under the treaty stipulations with Venezuela by the commissioners appointed for the purpose, that if upon the location of the boundary a settlement made by the British should be found on the Venezuela side, and that it had been made more than half a century ago, the boundary should be so located as to embrace that settlement within British territory. In our opinion the same rule should apply in settling the disputed boundary between Canada and the United States, that if there should be any town which was built up more than half a century ago upon our side of the boundary by the people of the United States, that should go to them according to the rule laid down between Venezuela and Great Britain; but our United States friends, as I understand it, were not prepared to accept that proposition. They propose that any town, no matter how recently built by them in Canadian territory, should go to them in any event. That was one of the differences, as I understand it, on that question. Then there was also a difference of opinion, which I need not discuss at the present time, in regard to the manner in

which a commission or board of arbitration should be constituted for the purpose of settling those difficulties. My hon. friend has referred in this matter to the death of Lord Herschell. I may say that I think we all equally lament the death of that distinguished statesman and jurist. Lord Herschell was a man of far more than ordinary ability, and far more than ordinary industry. He had devoted himself with great energy and great zeal and with extraordinary intelligence, and had studied all the disputed questions that required a settlement between Canada and the United States. No man could be better qualified by his attainments and by his ability for the commission appointed to consider these questions than the late Lord Herschell. He gave them special attention and I cannot but feel, as I am sure every hon. gentleman here does, that it was a great misfortune to this country when Lord Herschell died. His services would have been invaluable to us, not only in the settlement of the questions in controversy, but the special attention which he had given to all those subjects, the thorough acquaintance which he had acquired with respect to them, as well as his interest in this country and familiarity with it, which nearly eight or nine months had given him, would have been of invaluable service to Canada in future years had Lord Herschell's life been spared; so I cannot help but feel, as I am sure every one here does, that it was a calamity to this country when Lord Herschell died.

My hon. friend has referred to the penny postage. He thinks that it is an advantage simply to merchants. I do not agree with that view, and I think if my hon. friend will reflect for a moment he will see that its beneficial influence is very much wider than he has stated. Merchants may, to some extent be benefited by the system of penny postage, but the people who will perhaps avail themselves of it most are those who have relations scattered abroad throughout the Empire and in the neighbouring republic. It will result in very much more frequent communication between the scattered members of different families and, in my opinion, will become an important bond of union between different sections of the British Empire as well as between the Empire and the English speaking population of the neighbouring republic. All the ties that spring up between one section of the Empire