

the triumph of the popular will, which we have here according to the British system, than it has for the presidential system which prevails on the other side of the line. I have never heard any gentleman who represented in any shape any section of the Liberal party or any constituency in the interest of the Liberal party, express a preference for the presidential as opposed to our parliamentary system, and I maintain it was an unfair use to make of the position the hon. gentleman occupied in England, that he should make a statement eminently calculated to discredit his political opponents and without any foundation in fact. At the same time, the hon. gentleman was good enough to say that :

"Any Englishman, in coming to Canada, if he was a man of education, invariably joined the Canadian Conservative party, no matter what his home politics may have been."

I do not know, I am sure, under what circumstances the hon. gentleman made such a statement, but I say he inflicted a gross insult on a very large portion of the most intelligent part of this community, who have come from England, are educated men, and are warm adherents of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman made another statement on the same occasion. In giving what he thought was a historical *résumé* of past history, he declared, with some very violent language which I will not read, for we are accustomed to it from the hon. gentleman, that the conduct of the Liberal party had been that of demagogues in Canada, and then he went on to say :

"And they charged Sir George Cartier with being little better than a French speaking Englishman."

That was the climax of the hon. gentleman's attack upon us, that we had charged Sir George Cartier with being no better than a French speaking Englishman. Why, I fancy, if the hon. gentleman's audience had been present when Sir George Cartier was in England on a former occasion, they would have heard him making the same statement. That was Sir George Cartier's public statement with reference to his position. But the hon. gentleman turns this speech, which came from the lips of his own colleague, into a dreadful accusation hurled at him by political opponents. I hope the hon. gentleman, on future occasions, when in England, will be a little more accurate when he attempts to describe the actions and conduct of his political opponents. The hon. gentleman ought to have remembered, when he gave that account, which I have read, of the principles and views of the Liberal party, that the only man of the quondam annexationists of 1849 now prominent in public life, Sir David Macpherson, is a colleague of his own. He ought to remember that the most prominent advocate of independence in Canada was a former colleague of his own, his Minister of Finance for many years, who declined to receive the honor of knighthood except upon the distinct understanding that he held views on independence which he would be at perfect liberty to uphold; and who denounced the hon. gentleman in 1875, but, as a repentant sinner, was afterwards received by the hon. gentleman into his service. Under these circumstances, it little becomes the hon. gentleman to make such attacks as he has made in the absence of those whom he was aspersing. Besides the absence of those subjects in the Speech, there are some other little omissions. The hon. gentleman had found place in the Speech from the Throne last year for the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in *Russell* and the *Queen*. There has been a greater decision since then. There has been a decision on the boundary question. The *Russell* case settled a point of law with reference to what the hon. gentleman thought were the relative jurisdictions of the Dominion and the Provinces. The decision of the boundary question decided the fate, as the hon. gentleman described it, of a kingdom, and yet we find no statement of it. There is much said upon this subject, which I am a little compelled to disagree with. People seem to think that the issue is very different from what I

have always thought the issue to have been. A great question has been settled; a question between Canada and one of the Provinces; a question promoted by this Administration, in one point of view, which it afterwards thrust upon one of the Provinces, and which has ultimately been decided adversely to that Administration. I say adversely to that Administration. The issue was, as to what the boundary of Ontario was, and upon that subject, as long ago as March, 1872, the Government presided over by the hon. gentleman made this declaration with reference to that boundary :

"The boundary in question is clearly identical with the limits of the Province of Quebec, according to 14 George III, chap. 83, the Quebec Act, and described as follows * * * Extending along the river Ohio westward to the banks of the Mississippi (that is the junction of the two rivers) and northward to the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory. The southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory is well understood to be the height of land dividing the waters which flow into Hudson's Bay from those entering the valley of the Great Lakes, and forming the northern boundary of Ontario."

Therefore, the position the hon. gentleman took at that time was that the boundary of Ontario was the due north line from the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi on the one part, and the height of land upon the other part. The Government of Ontario stated its position in the course of that correspondence, which was practically the boundary of the Lake of the Woods to the westward and on the north a line to the northward of the height of land. Then the hon. gentleman, on the 17th November, 1872, reported, stating this :

"The northern boundary of Ontario the Government believe to be the line of the watershed separating the waters that run towards Lake Superior from those which run towards Hudson's Bay, and the western boundary a line drawn in accordance with the provisions of 14 Geo. III., chap. 83, from the conflux of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers northward, that is, by the shortest northward course to the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory."

There, Sir, were the two statements of the Administration on that subject. Then there came an attempt to ascertain what the boundary was, and the arbitration was arranged, and the award took place, and the hon. gentleman, in opposition to the contention from this side of the House, that the award ought to be accepted, declared that it should not be accepted. Why? Because he said it was all wrong, that we ought to have an entirely different boundary from that which was found by the award. He said this :

"They"—that is the Dominion Parliament or Government—"say it is not a true boundary—that the Dominion wants simply what by law is their right. The Ontario Government and Legislature have no right to ask more, but they say no. They passed a law accepting the award, because they saw it added an additional kingdom to Ontario, as was the remark of its Premier, and they will not do anything else."

Once again :

"The effect of settling the boundary between these Provinces will compel, I do not say the Province of Ontario, but the present Government of Ontario, to be reasonable, and not to insist upon a boundary which cannot be supported in any court or tribunal in the world. They will come to terms quick enough when they find that they must do so. To use an expression which is common in Scotland, it is land hungry they are for that country, and they are resolved to get it rightly or wrongly."

Then again :

"Nor is it the duty of the Dominion Government to accept their idea of the facts; because, according to my idea, the whole case was given away before the arbitrators. Anybody reading the case would see that it was most wretchedly managed on the part of the Dominion. An inferior man, though a respectable man in his way, Mr. McMahon, was chosen to conduct the whole case, instead of employing the first legal ability in the country—instead of the Minister of Justice himself conducting the case before the arbitrators. The whole case was thrown away—it looks almost as if it was deliberately thrown away. Never was such a case so given away as the case of the Dominion was on the very face of it."

Now we find that this subject is once more discussed; but, before it was discussed, and at the very time at which this debate took place from which I have been reading these extracts, the hon. gentleman was arranging to thrust the issue upon a sister Province and to hand over to Manitoba