

inquiry by men whose judgment would be accepted by both parties. The natural inference would be that they would be judges. Our assumption was that they would be judges of the Supreme Court. The time came when the public were advised that the treaty was likely to fall through. The Senate were not disposed to adopt it. What then occurred? A week or ten days elapsed and it was announced that the Senate would probably approve of the bill. In that interim on doubt negotiations passed, and it was quite understood that two gentlemen of unexceptional qualifications from the standpoint of the United States would be named, and therefore under those considerations the Senate approved of the treaty. It is possible—and I hope for the best—that some good will evolve from it. Even if they do not agree, we shall at least observe the spirit that prompted the treaty, by appointing such members on the commission as will at least savor of the qualifications that were originally intended to apply to them—that is, high judicial authorities. The Lord Chief Justice of England will be one. We shall appoint two gentlemen, I presume, within a day or two, at all events—two gentlemen to whose appointment no exception can be taken, and we can only trust that from the evidence which may be evolved in the inquiry, the better minds in the United States and in Canada will be able to say where the weight of testimony lies, and where the boundary line ought to be. Having succeeded that far, we should trust to the good sense of one or both countries to yield to the arbitrament which seems fair and just.

With these observations, I will take my seat, expressing the belief that the measures the government have to present to parliament will come down within a reasonable period and that there will be no justification in assuming that parliament is going to sit for any longer term than usual. The financial statement will be made within a reasonable time, and the important measures will all be before parliament, and I think within the usual limit for the sitting of parliament that they will be satisfactorily disposed of.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Canada will have the right to appoint two of the commissioners and England one?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes. The Lord Chief Justice of England has been appointed.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Before offering any comments on the important subjects referred to in the Speech with which His Excellency has opened the present session of parliament, I desire to enter my protest against the lateness of the period at which we have been called together to discharge our legislative duties. Not perhaps during any session since the present government has come into power have the measures we will likely be asked to consider been of a more weighty character, or more difficult, to dispose of than they promise to be during this session. If the legislation foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne is all to be dealt with, in addition to the largely increased private legislation, the session must inevitably last six months, and bring us into the sweltering heat of Ottawa in midsummer, which unfits most men for the work of legislation, and greatly interferes with the attendance of members of both houses. Besides, late sessions are injurious to the business interests of the great majority of members who are kept in attendance on their parliamentary duties after spring time with great difficulty, and the country thus loses the benefit of the knowledge and experience of many of its ablest representatives.

During the years of Conservative rule, myself and others frequently had occasion to make a similar protest to that I am now presenting, and often with good effect, being generally met with a promise from the then leaders of the Senate that cause of complaint on this subject would cease to be given.

I hold that there is no justification for the lateness of the present session of parliament. It is true that the Prime Minister is said to be in feeble health, which I am sure all regret. With, however, a majority of about fifty in the House of Commons, could not his colleagues afford to give the premier a long rest, which might prove of permanent benefit to his health? The truth is, that ministers have been spending too much time in festivities and idleness since the rising of parliament last year, and have consequently neglected the preparation of the important measures of legislation that