

proposed a vote for the purpose and it was then said that it would cost about two million dollars. The population was small, and they did not feel warranted at the time in making that particular survey. It is purely a question of survey. The terms of the treaty are not disputed. I think as a matter of compromise at the time it was agreed between the two countries that we should mark off the line where it crossed the Stikine and other rivers, but it was going to cost too much entirely to run out this particular boundary. That, I think, is what actually occurred, because I remember something of it myself. A number of despatches passed between the two countries twenty years ago. Now, to-day I see by the American returns that the population of Alaska is nearly 6,000 whites and some 33,000 Indians. I do not know what the population of our own North-West, and British Columbia adjoining that, is, but it cannot be very much, and it is doubtful if there is any necessity to define the boundary now, unless it is to remove a certain degree of friction. To my mind, the natural way between two friendly countries would be to arrange a conventional boundary until the population on the one side or on the other was sufficient to warrant the necessity of positively making out this particular line. No doubt it is a very expensive boundary. The expensive part is, of course, the fringe of land that runs along the coast up to the particular part where the meridian runs, because it is entirely a matter of cost; I have never heard of any dispute as to the interpretation to be given to the treaty, because the treaty is plain and speaks for itself. I have the terms of it under my hand here this moment, if it is desirable to read them. I do not suppose it is; it cannot be disputed. The next paragraph I notice refers to an amicable understanding for reciprocal services in case of wreckage and salvage. It was not necessary to go to Washington to accomplish that. The Government of the United States—at least, so it was announced in the debate we had a few years ago, and the statement was not disputed—had on their statute book a law which allowed reciprocity in wreckage, and it was to be put in force whenever the President was advised that Canada had adopted a similar law. A Bill with that object in view was introduced in the other House by the member

from Frontenac in 1888, and was defeated in that Chamber. The supporters of the National Policy considered that it was an attack on their system, so it was thrown out. In 1889 he renewed the attempt to pass the Bill and secured a majority vote. The measure came up to this Chamber and was debated here. We all know its fate in the Senate—it was thrown out by gentlemen who believed that it was disturbing and interfering with the National Policy. It was contended that Canadian tugs had to be protected as well as Canadian cotton manufacturers. I am glad to see that other views are now prevailing and that we are to have reciprocity in wreckage. I have always myself been in favour of it, because I think the circumstances of the two countries are such that it is monstrous that vessels in distress on one side or the other should not be allowed to employ the first tug that could reach them, or the cheapest tugs that could be obtained. The hon. Senator from Charlottetown rather enlarged upon that, and if I understand him, rather approved of going further. He spoke of the advantages that reciprocity in the coasting trade would be to the Dominion. I quite agree with him, and I should be exceedingly glad to see the coasting trade thrown open between the two countries. The more of those difficulties that are removed between the two countries the more prosperous will each country be, and the easier it will be ultimately to reach some understanding as to how far the international trade between the two countries could be carried. There are various other questions referred to in the Address, which I do not purpose just now to discuss. They relate to Bills that will, no doubt, be brought up to us in due time. Some of them, I trust, will be introduced in this Chamber, as we have the Premier here, and he, no doubt, will be disposed to give the Senate a fair share of the early discussion of Government measures. There is one subject which I think I ought not to omit calling attention to—that is, we will be called upon to consider a measure to redistribute the seats consequent on the census returns. I trust that any measure that may be brought down by the Government will be on a somewhat fairer basis than that which was introduced ten years ago, and which was known as the Gerrymander Bill, by which several members of the House of Commons were simply legislated out of their seats, and old bound-