

cellor, Lord Selborne. It was represented that either of these gentlemen would be willing to come out here and undertake the task of arbitrating upon the matter in view of the very large extent of territory at stake. It was intimated that so far as Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell were concerned, if the Ontario Government agreed to a new arbitration, they might select either. That proposition did not seem to him (Mr. Mowat) a satisfactory one. They had had one arbitration—(Hear, hear)—and it did not seem to him to be of any service to have a new one. It had also appeared to him that the people of this country would regard the result of the arbitration which they had already had as entitled to much greater weight than the decision of either Lord Cairns or Lord Selborne. It was probable that neither of those gentlemen was known to one in a hundred of the people who knew Chief Justice Harrison, Sir Francis Hincks, and Sir Edward Thornton. If any litigation were to be had—which he considered very unjust and unreasonable—he was of opinion that it ought to be before the Privy Council. He thought that if the award were not confirmed no new arbitrators who could be chosen would be satisfactory to the country, and that if further litigation were to be had the case should go to the Privy Council. It would be remembered that this was the method favoured by Sir John Macdonald in 1872. No proposals had been made by the Dominion Government as to provisional arrangements for the government of the disputed territory, though they (the Ontario Government) had made such proposals on several occasions.

Mr. MEREDITH—Were any propositions made for the temporary government of the country other than those which were made in the course of the correspondence in reference to the disallowance of the Bill that was passed two years ago in regard to that matter?

Mr. MOWAT thought such proposals had been made several times and on separate occasions to the same effect. He did not at the moment remember any substantial variation in what was proposed in reference to the provisional arrangements. It had always seemed to him that there would be no object whatever in agreeing to go to the Privy Council, abandoning the present award, and submitting to a second litigation unless it was for the sake of securing provisional arrangements in the meantime. It would be remembered that two sets of laws existed in the disputed territory, and two sets of legal machinery. It was impossible to obtain a clear title to land in that country, and the practical evils arising from the want of any settled system of law, or any recognized courts, or of any power to grant licenses to cut timber were very great. And in view of these practical evils it might be worth while to forego their objection to a second litigation if they could make a satisfactory settlement in regard to provisional arrangements in the meantime.

Mr. MEREDITH—Were any suggestions made in the course of the discussion as to the facts upon which the tribunal would have to pronounce? Of course if the facts are in dispute then the Privy Council could not deal with the question, and in view of the suggestion made, it might be thought that Lord Cairns or Lord Selborne would deal with it, and take evidence.

Mr. MOWAT could not say what was said upon that subject, but he had no objection to stating his views upon that point. He thought there was no difficulty, in their going to the Privy Council, notwithstanding that there was a dispute in regard to certain facts. A large quantity of material had been prepared in the shape of documents, etc., bearing upon the question during the previous negotiations, and provided both parties agreed that the Privy Council should decide upon that material, all that they (the Council) would have to do would be to draw the deductions of fact from it. At the same time he would say further that after an agreement had been come to with regard to the facts and evidence to be laid before the Privy Council, the second litigation would involve an enormous delay and enormous expense as well. (Applause.)

Mr. MORRIS (who was now in his seat) asked when the proposal was made to which his hon. friend had objected?

Mr. MOWAT was not able to state the exact time, but he would mention a circumstance which would probably enable his hon. friend to fix the date. Some little correspondence had passed about a meeting, and the result was a proposal to which he (Mr. Mowat) acceded, viz., that the interview should take place when the hon. gentlemen representing the Dominion came up here to attend the great Conservative Convention. (Laughter.) About the time that that Convention was held the only personal interviews upon the subject took place, and the proposition was then made. (Applause.)

THE ADDRESS.

The debate on the Address was resumed.

Mr. WATERS, in opening, first referred to one or two statements by the member for Dundas. The Government was charged with taking the appointment of gaolers out of the hands of the people, but it was well known that the people never had the appointment of gaolers, and now the appointment was not taken away from the Sheriff's altogether. The nominations were left in the hands of the Sheriff subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The member for Dundas had referred to the action of the Legislature in taking away the right of appointment by the people of Division Court clerks and bailiffs. These were rights which the people never had. The appointments had been in the hands of the County Court Judges. His own opinion was that it was a very judicious proceeding, as it took away patronage from the County Judge, which was sometimes disagreeable. The next point to which the member for Dundas had referred was the License Act. Mr. Waters acknowledged that the changes took away certain privileges of the people from the municipal council, and that there was nothing left to the municipal councils but the power of limiting the number of licenses. The amended License Act had been in operation for some years, and he contended that the results showed that the Act was working in the interests of the people. He referred the member for Dundas to the report of the Inspector of Licenses for Dundas County, which said that the new Act was a decided improvement, drunkenness had decreased, and that there was not, to his knowledge, a single unlicensed seller. The reports

from the other inspectors were of a similar character. Speaking of the revival of trade, attributed to the good harvest, he said that exception had been taken by the Opposition to the omission by the Government of any reference in the Speech from the Throne to the National Policy as being one of the factors to which was due the present prosperity. He thought the Government had acted very wisely in not introducing a reference to the National Policy, and that they were perfectly justified in using the expressions which they had used. The total exports from Ontario for the year 1833 were valued at \$25,565,511. The exports of animals and their products were valued at \$18,258,920, or 71½ per cent. of the whole exports. This showed that the agricultural interest did more than anything else to contribute to the prosperity of this Province. There was certainly reason for thankfulness to the Great Giver of all good for the good harvests. And they had had exceptionally high prices, to which various circumstances contributed, one being that the wheat crop in some portions of the United States was not up to that of this Province, and we reaped the advantage. He did not mean to forget the other industries, but the agricultural interest was the main foundation of the prosperity. In speaking of the Boundary Award, he noticed the matter with a good deal of regret, because at the last session he was of opinion that the Dominion would ratify the award. The opinions he held at that time, it had transpired, were not well founded. Referring to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, he said that the Dominion Government had given to Manitoba territory to which Ontario was justly entitled. (Hear, hear.) He did not say that the boundaries of Manitoba should not have been enlarged, but the territory to which Ontario was entitled was not the only territory which could have been given. They had territory to the north, and down to the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, but instead of that they came down to what they contended before the arbitrators was the true boundary of this Province.

Mr. MEREDITH—"No, no."

Mr. WATERS replied that the hon. gentleman had not attempted to show anything else. (Hear, hear.) The Ottawa Government had complicated the question by bringing Manitoba into the question. With regard to the finding of the arbitrators he did not see how they could have arrived at any other conclusion. They would have had to ignore a great deal of documentary evidence which it was impossible to ignore. In the year 1783, after the American war, it became necessary to describe the boundaries in the commission to the Lieutenant-Governor, and in that commission it was said that the westerly boundary extended to the Mississippi. It had since been ascertained that the Mississippi did not go up to the 43rd parallel, but it was the intention to extend the Province to that river. (Hear, hear.) This commission to Sir Guy Carlton, in dividing the then Province of Quebec into Upper and Lower Canada, put the Province right to the shores of Hudson Bay. This and other documents were before the arbitrators and their genuineness was not disputed, and they showed what was the intention of the English Government at the time when the Province was divided. They had also the contention made by the Dominion Government, in a note to the Colonial Secretary, that the boundary was laid down by the Act of 1791, which was the Act dividing the Province of Quebec into Upper and Lower Canada, and that it included the country to the Lake of the Woods and Red River. It was incorrect to say that the people of the country did not regard this boundary question as one of great importance, and he would not have hesitated to oppose the Government if they had not been fully sensible to their duty in protecting the rights of the Province. On the question of the Streams Bill he did not deny the right of veto, but he did not think it was a power to be exercised when a Province legislated within the scope of its jurisdiction. It was easy to understand that the power of veto was a safeguard which it was quite proper to reserve to the Dominion Government in cases where, for instance, the rights of a minority were interfered with, but in the present instance there was no justification for disallowance. The Bill was not introduced and passed in the interest of Mr. Caldwell, but in the interest of the lumbermen at large. No question had come up since Confederation calling for more united action on the part of all the members of this House. The power of veto as applied to questions of purely Provincial interest was uncalled for by the Dominion Government. It was a power which, if maintained and exercised, would reduce the present status of Provincial legislatures to that of very unimportant bodies. When Confederation was entered into it was upon the well defined understanding that we were to have control of our own local affairs, but now at this late hour the Dominion Government stepped back from their onward progress and vetoed a Bill that was clearly within the province of this House to pass. He concluded by promising his support to the Government in securing by legitimate means the rights of Ontario to her territory, as well as her constitutional rights respecting legislation. (Cheers.)

Mr. BRERETON spoke in favour of the National Policy, and read from statistics respecting the Cobourg Car works in support of his contention. He favoured a settlement of the boundary question by negotiation with Manitoba or appeal to the Privy Council. He defended the position of the Ontario Opposition in upholding the course taken by the Dominion Government on the important questions mentioned in the Speech.

Mr. McMAHON regretted that any discussion respecting the National Policy should have crept into the House, but hon. gentlemen opposite had themselves to blame for it. Whether that policy had been of benefit or not he was not prepared to say, but he was sure it did not deserve that unlimited praise which the Conservatives were disposed to accord to it. It was a question whether in the event of one or two bad harvests, the National Policy would be found at all beneficial, but in any case the Lieut.-Governor was fully justified in not referring to it in the Speech. The question of questions, however, to the people of Ontario was the Boundary Award, and the manner in which it had been treated by the Federal authorities. There was no doubt of the evidence of a strong feeling throughout the Province that we were entitled to a large portion of the territory of which we had been deprived by the Dominion Government and that it was always understood that