

ernment were signed by four attorneys general, one of them being Charles Lanctot, then attorney general of the province of Quebec; but officially and legally the province of Quebec was out of the case. The least that could have been done would be for the Canadian government to submit the proposed agreement to the Quebec legislature in accordance with the British North America Act of 1871, and obtain the consent of that legislature.

I must add that in signing such an agreement in 1922 the Liberal government discredited an engagement that had been taken in 1908 by their leader, the then prime minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In fact, on July 13, 1908, in introducing in this house a motion for the bill that was passed in 1912 regarding the extension of boundaries of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, we find, at column 12,789 of the *Hansard* of that year, a statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Speaking of the dispute which had arisen between Newfoundland and Quebec, he said:

We have taken the precaution to ask the province of Quebec to be a party to that arbitration because it is interested in the boundary wherever it may ultimately be decided to be.

And further on he says:

In 1881, when the act was passed extending the boundary of Manitoba to the frontier of Ontario, the contest was removed from Canada to Ontario and Manitoba; they were the parties who fought the issue. In the same way, if we allow this territory to go to Quebec, Quebec will become interested in the question; then, though we retain our sovereignty, I think they should have a say and become a party to the question.

Notwithstanding that engagement, as I said a few minutes ago, when the second agreement was signed in 1922 by the Liberal government it does not appear anywhere that it had been signed with the consent of the Quebec legislature. And today the present government goes much further in putting aside the directions given by its ex-leader, and does not hesitate to dispose finally of the same territory without consulting the province of Quebec. That is the reason why I contend that this offer by the Canadian government to the government of Newfoundland is not worth the paper on which it is written, and I am sure that the province of Quebec will never assent to such an agreement. That is also why the present government should refrain from offering to Newfoundland a territory over which it has no jurisdiction, so as to prevent a regrettable misunderstanding which would result in a real conflict between the Canadian government and one of the provinces.

Let us now make an analysis of the value of the report of the privy council and see if

we can find in it some final solution to the problem. It is interesting to note in the reading of the report itself that Their Lordships clearly show that the question submitted to them was not properly and completely presented. If we refer to page 2 of their report we read:

But the duty of the board is not to consider where the boundary in question might wisely and conveniently be drawn, but only to determine where, under the documents of title which have been brought to their notice, that boundary is actually to be found.

Further at page 11 of the same report, the Lord Chancellor states:

In these circumstances the question to be determined is not whether Newfoundland possesses territory upon the peninsula of Labrador, but what is the inland boundary of that territory. Is it to be defined by a line following the sinuosities of the shore at a distance of one mile or thereabouts from high-water mark, or is it to be found at the watershed of the rivers falling into the sea on that shore? No third alternative has been suggested by any person.

And at page 14:

The case for Canada admits that it may be found impracticable to lay down such a line upon the land, and suggests that, in order that neither party may suffer by reason of this difficulty, the boundary should be drawn along the coast at a distance of one mile from high-water mark; but Their Lordships cannot think that in adopting such a proposal they would be performing the duty cast upon them by the terms of reference to determine the boundary "under the statutes, orders in council and proclamations."

Then we come to the conclusion of the report, which we find at page 23, the last words of which are: "and they will humbly advise His Majesty accordingly." Therefore that report shows not only that the question was not properly submitted to the privy council, but that there was no binding decision rendered. In fact we must ask ourselves what was done after and as a consequence of that report. Was there any legislation by the Imperial, the Canadian or the Newfoundland government? There was none. Was there any treaty or any agreement embodying the findings of the privy council? There was none either. Then I believe I am right in contending that the whole matter still stands as it was decided by the Canadian statutes of 1898 and 1912.

Furthermore I contend that this matter should never have been submitted to the privy council because it was a tribunal of one of the parties. I must however emphatically declare that I would not for a moment cast any reflection on the integrity and honesty of the members of the privy council; but as a matter of fact I do not think we ever saw in the history of the world a case of delimitation of boundaries being submitted to the tribunal of