

the hon. gentleman object to the award? Does Ontario get more than she is entitled to? The hon. gentleman has not condescended to tell us what are his objections to the award, only he says it is an absurd boundary; that there is no justification, in fact, or law for it; and that there is no statesman or geographer, that ever studied the subject, would have dreamed of laying down a boundary such as the arbitrators have laid down. But let me go a step further. In order to fix the western and northern boundaries of Ontario. I attach great importance to the description given in the Quebec Act of 1774 and the commissions issued under it. The hon. gentleman says that these commissions do not aid us to an interpretation of the meaning of that Act. He points out that the first commission to Sir Guy Carleton cannot avail us, because it was rescinded within a few months of its issue. It is true the commission was so rescinded, but not by reason of any defect in the description of the territory over which he was appointed Governor. The hon. gentleman does not explain the reason of this rescision, nor why he changed his mind as to the effect of it. I do not know what has changed the hon. gentleman's mind, but I do not think it was the rescission of the commissions, but rather the non-issue of a commission, about which the hon. gentleman knows something, at a much later day than the period of Sir Guy Carleton. I have disposed of the views of the eminent statesmen who have given their opinions on this subject, and amongst others, the Dawson brothers, and I wish now to refer to another question touched upon by hon. gentlemen opposite, and notably by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). That hon. gentleman started out with the proposition that the Quebec Act did fix a definite boundary—a proposition which is denied by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) and in this I am disposed to agree with him. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said that the two commissions which were issued, one on the 27th Dec., 1774, and the other in 1786 to Sir Guy Carleton, and the one to Sir Frederiek Haldimand in 1777, do not help us to an interpretation of the Act of 1774. He says there was a definite boundary fixed by that Act, and that commissions issued under it cannot be used to contract or extend the limits given by the Act. No one proposes to use these commissions for the purpose of extending or contracting the boundary fixed by the Act; but if there is any ambiguity in the wording of a Statute—any difficulty in defining its proper interpretation—these commissions may be used for the purposes of putting an interpretation on it; and, if there is any difficulty in putting a proper interpretation on the Act of 1774, we have