

authority in the Empire. I hope, Sir, that, if a Committee be appointed, it will be composed of members from different Provinces, who will give their closest attention to the history, as well as the legal and constitutional aspects of the question. It will soon be discovered that it is not capable of mathematical or astronomical solution. It cannot be finally disposed of by any report or recommendation of a Select Committee. The Government will be responsible for the action of this House, and no Committee can relieve them of that responsibility. A Committee will be able to collect the material facts and the evidence bearing on the case. They will be able to report upon it more easily now than at any former time, and Parliament will, after such examination and report, be in a better position to determine either to confirm the award or remit the question to a legal tribunal.

MR. CASEY: I do not feel, Sir, that this motion can be allowed to pass without some protest from even the less prominent members from Ontario. I consider, Sir, that this is the most important question relating to Ontario that has come before this House since Confederation. The hon. member for Halton has ably observed that, dealing with a question involving so great an interest as the possession of 64,000,000 acres of land we should proceed with the utmost gravity, solemnity and deliberation. The hon. mover of this motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice and the leader of the Government, have asked us to practically settle this question now. They ask us to utterly disregard the award. I think I am borne out by the resolution, which shows no reference to the award at all. You would never know from the wording of it that there had been an award made. You would suppose that the question was still as open as it was during the period before the Arbitrators decided the question. Now, Sir, this is something the people of Ontario will not endure in silence. I doubt if even the Conservative members from Ontario in this House will tolerate it in silence, or even after the use of vigorous language. At any rate, they cannot vote for this resolution without destroying the title deeds of Ontario, to this enormous extent of territory. The people of Ontario would object to anything in

the slightest degree calculated to injure the authority of this award. They will object still more strongly to the ignoring of that award in a spirit which is eventually hostile to their Province. We have no difficulty in discovering from the speech of the right hon. gentleman opposite, and by his sneering remark that "Ontario would, perhaps, get as much as she expected by the award," his hostile feeling to the Province. Perhaps, sir, he is aware that, although he has a majority in this House from Ontario, he has not the people of that Province at his back, and is hostile to her because he knows her hostility to him. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is calculating on the profit he would make, in a political sense, by favouring the sister Province of Quebec, but I am quite sure, from what I know of the members of the French race who sit in this House, that they would not countenance the perpetration of an injustice upon, or a breach of faith with, the larger Province. The hon. gentleman may find himself amiss in the calculations he has made. What are the grounds on which the right hon. gentleman has attacked the award? Was it because of the *personnel* of the Board who made it? No. Because of a defective presentation of the case before them? No. Because of any suspicion of foul play by them? No. It was on the sole ground that the mode of appointing those Arbitrators was irregular—that they should not have been appointed by the Executives of the Dominion and the Province without the consent of Parliament. He says tragically: "Fancy an English Government appointing a Commission of that sort by an Order in Council without authority from Parliament." The hon. gentleman's memory must be very short if he forgets he himself was appointed by the English Government, without authority from Parliament, a member of the Joint High Commission that sat at Washington to conclude the Treaty which concerned the boundary line between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, along with other matters. It was this Commission, appointed without the assent of Parliament, that concluded the Treaty by which we lost the Island of San Juan on the Pacific coast. When the Emperor of Germany decided, under the Treaty made by my right hon. friend,