

point at a distance 10 leagues from the sea, and that they desired to keep about the same distance from the sea all the way to the northern boundary, but literal conformity to that idea seems impracticable. That is difficulty number two. Then there is no perfectly continuous chain of mountains running absolutely parallel to the sea. That is difficulty number three. Then the question arises where is the sea? which is the greatest difficulty of all. What is to be considered the shore of the sea from which the 10 leagues are to be counted? The shore of that portion of Alaska is of the most extraordinary character possible. It is full of inlets running along the shore with islands interspersed amongst them, and this kind of coast extends out a considerable distance towards the sea. Our friends on the other side, who do not usually neglect demanding anything they can get, pretend that the extreme inmost line of these indentations of the coast constitutes the sea, and that the line must run at 10 leagues distance all round the ends of each inlet, running up into the mountains sometimes 30 or 40 leagues from the sea. To survey a line like that, and lay it out, would probably cost the enormous sum that my hon. friend mentions, and which is said to have been the estimated expense of delimitation. I do not know a subject between the United States and ourselves that possesses one-tenth part of the difficulty that will be found in delimiting the boundary of Alaska. I think our rights are plain, and when we come to assert them we shall no doubt endeavour to make them prevail, but that we shall do so without difficulty, as my hon. friend says, is just as absolutely impossible as we have found it hitherto to settle other questions of a similar character with the United States not one-tenth part so difficult. These were the principal criticisms, I think, which my hon. friend addressed to the Speech in respect of the subjects I have just spoken of. My hon. friend diverged a little towards the subject of politics, and spoke of the promise in the Speech that there shall be a Bill for the redistribution of seats. And he expressed the hope that it will be fairer than the last. I do not know which was the last—Mr. Mowat's or this Government's. I know I had a letter from a distinguished politician in Ontario which I received yesterday, in which he stated that he thought the intention of both those Acts was the same, but that Mr. Mowat's

was scientifically perfect in carrying out that intention; so I do not know whether my hon. friend meant or hoped it would be fairer than Mr. Mowat's or fairer than Sir John Macdonald's.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Our politics here are not local.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT—Well, the politics unfortunately, or fortunately, perhaps, are more or less local as well as general, and we know that the two parties hold identically the same principles in the two legislatures. When we refer to Liberals and Conservatives we refer probably to those holding Liberal or Conservative views, not only in this Parliament, but in the Local Legislature, and, assuming that my friend meant Mr. Mowat's Bill, I venture to say that the Redistribution Bill will be fairer than the last, and will not need to be scientifically constructed, because I think I may say it will be of an extremely simple character. My hon. friend also, before he finished, administered to himself some little consolation for the trifling misfortunes which have befallen upon himself and his friends during the last month or two. He found a great many reasons why the elections should go against the Liberal party. He thought that the lists were tampered with at Ottawa, and he thought that the judges manipulated the lists.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No; I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT—I think that the hon. gentleman stated that the revising officers were all officials of the Dominion Government, and that it might fairly be presumed that these gentlemen did not neglect the interests of the Government in framing the lists. And as the printing was in the hands of the Dominion it might also be presumed that the printers would insert names which they thought were needed to make up a sufficient volume of votes for the Conservative party. I do not think I shall dwell on those two objections, because I do not think my hon. friend would seriously make them. The revising officers are largely county judges, and in almost every case, I daresay I might say in every case, but I do not know that positively, men of good position, men belonging to our own profession, who have a singular faculty for throwing off prejudices when they assume a judicial position. That has been the uni-