

Woods touches the waters of the Mississippi, but this does not alter the boundaries as established by the Quebec Act; and the Act of 1803, giving concurrent jurisdiction to Upper Canada and Quebec, in the Indian Territories, effectually settled the matter. The document goes on to say :

“Further, the Territory so awarded to Ontario is less than was comprised in Upper Canada, according to the true intent and meaning of the Quebec Act, 1774, as shown by its recitals and by its known objects and its history, including the proceedings thereon in the House of Commons, as reported in the ‘Cavendish Debates,’ and as set forth in the letter of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke, dated 2nd August, 1774, to his constituents, the Province of New York, whose agent he was at the time.”

The letter of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke refers solely to the boundaries of the then Province of New York of which he was the agent, and the true intent and meaning of the Quebec Act, 1774, as explained in the judgment given by the highest Court existing in Canada in 1818, is very different from that claimed for it in this paper. The advocates opposing the Dominion always try to make little of the unanimous decision of the Judges in the De Reinhard case, but let any unprejudiced person read the report of that trial, and he will see that the whole case hinges on the matter of the boundaries. He will see that the case was most ably argued on both sides, that there was no want of information, and that those taking the Upper Canada view argued the matter with a power and an eloquence which contrast very strongly with the feeble arguments put forth in the same direction nowadays. The Judges who gave their decision on that occasion, as to the western boundary of Upper Canada were as high in position, and as able to come to a reasonable decision, as the Arbitrators who made the late award, and they had evidently studied the case, which the latter do not seem to have done. But it is said in this paper that “the decision was come to without the Court being aware of the terms of the Royal Commissions to the Governors.” On this point, the Court ruled that the Crown could extend the jurisdiction or withdraw it again within narrower limits. This is admitted by the present advocates of the westward extension of Ontario, and what would they make of the later Royal Commissions limiting the western

jurisdiction of Upper Canada to Lake Superior. In claiming so much for these Commissions, which are often contradictory the one of the other, they seem to have forgotten that the rule might work both ways. The paper goes on to say : “De Reinhard though clearly guilty, was not executed, and the only known or supposed reason for pardoning him is that the British Government were advised that the conclusion of the Court was not maintainable.” This is begging the question with a vengeance. The true cause of the pardon was that the case was considered by the Imperial authorities to have been one of homicide or manslaughter rather than of murder. For, in the official documents of the time, the country is described as being in a state of “private warfare” and in fact a war in which many lives were lost had been for a long time going on between two powerful rival corporations—the Hudson’s Bay Company and the old North-West Company of Canada. The document goes on to refer to what the Hudson’s Bay Company were content with in 1701, thirty years after the date of their Charter, but every one knows that they had then very powerful opposition, that France was at that time able to cope with England on the high seas. The true date from which to estimate the value of the rival claims was 1713—the date of the Treaty of Utrecht—when there was some sort of a definition of boundaries agreed on, in a measure, by both nations. But, if the award were far less objectionable than it is, if it did not run into territories the size of European kingdoms, which the country purchased from the Hudson’s Bay Company, to which, until that purchase was effected, Canada had clearly no claim, I will repeat that it demands a most thorough investigation by this House. It is useless to say that the territory is not valuable. It has rivers navigable for hundreds of miles from the sea inland, forests of great commercial importance, agricultural lands of vast extent, fisheries susceptible of great development, and it is all within the habitable parts of the continent, much of it having a climate equal, at least, to that of Ottawa. This is proved by a very able pamphlet issued by the Ontario Government, and by the recent reports of the Geological Survey. I now beg to move that a Select Committee be ap-