moments to the difficulties connected with, that question. It is a boundary that can only be ascertained by reference to certain points mentioned in the Act of 1774, and in Royal Proclamations and Commissions to Governors. So long as you are on the Mississippi, you have a natural boundary on the west, but when you get to Lake Itaska, the most northern source of that river, you are left on the prairie, and then, having nothing to explain the course intended by the word northward, I suppose you must go due north. Then on the north we have the limit "to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Hudson's Bay Company." The Minister of Justice is under the impression that we did not make any attempt to claim or define boundaries in the discussion with the Hudson's Bay authorities. That question, Sir, was very thoroughly discussed, and Mr. Mowat adopts the argument we used on that occasion, and makes it a part of his case.

scure

I find

Eng-

ry, in

lt the

nsult

own

erred

นร น

g the

And

stion

; into

ables

erial

es to

et as

rtain

juris.

order

rgan-

well

hich

f the

junc-

ippi.

have

tion.

it all

Com-

nent.

iting

orgc

ven-

g to

and

iight

then

this

d by

Em-

buas

sion.

ot, I

just

will

lain.

we

Pro-

ario

will.

iven

the

e to

y, 80

ore,

call

few

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): I did not say that my hon. friend did not raise the question of boundary at all; but I said that Ontario did not, antecedent to that diagonalism.

discussion. Mr. MACDOUGALL: The question had not arisen until Confederation, as regards Ontario, and, in every controversy with the Hudson's Bay Company, we always contended that our boundary went very far west of the Height of Land. The Government of Canada, on every public occasion, disputed the right of the Hudson's Bay Company to territory outside of the undefined circle about Hudson's Bay. They took that ground upon the final settlement of the question, when Sir George Cartier and myself represented the Government, and I never heard any complaint about our argument, except my right hon. friend said on our return : "You used pretty sharp language." I, for one, felt very warm upon that question, when I found that an ex-member of the Imperial Government had been appointed Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, and that, before our negotiations were concluded, we had to meet the arguments of a gentleman to whom we had shown our hand when the statement of our rights as against the Hudson's Bay Company wsa confidential ly laid before the Imperial Cabinet. Our territorial claims as against the Hudson's Bay Company are set forth at

length in the correspondence between the Canadian Delegates and the Colonial Office, and our arguments are quoted by Mr. Mowat in his statement of the case for Ontario, as being cogent and in accordance with facts. We were acting of the name and on behalf of Canada. We felt that we were reiterating the views entertained and expressed by the Government of Canada on all occasions since the question was first raised in Parliament, and I am not aware that the contention of the Canadian Government that the proprietary rights of the Hudson's Bay Company were restricted to the country they occupied prior to the Treaty of Paris of 1763, has ever been officially withdrawn or denied. If the Hudson's Bay Company had no legal right to the territory beyond the line laid down on the maps of that period—one or two hundred miles, perhaps, south of Hudson Bay-if that was the extreme extent southward to which they had laid claim, we have now to find, and the Judical Committee of the Privy Council, if the question be referred to them, will have to find, the southern limit of the territory of the Hudson's Bay Company as laid down by themselves. That will be as very difficult proposition-a very difficult question to dispose of hy metes and bounds. The Hudson's Bay Company at different periods extended their claims. The French Government on the other hand, on behalf of their citizens and traders, pushed the boundaries of the French territory as near to Hudson's Bay as possible. Commissioners were appointed on behalf of the two countries, who met and discussed the matter, and maps were submitted. I do not know that a Court of Law could find any rule or precedent applicable to such a case, that would justify it in fixing a boundary outside of the limits laid down by these Commissioners. I think it probable that a line must be found somewhere between these two. It will be impossible to mark it upon the ground by reference to any known landmarks or natural objects. It will be a matter of reasoning and conjecture, and therefore, in regard to that part of the case, it seems to me the question is one that can very well be disposed of by the authority of Parliament. The country between the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory as claimed either by the English or French Com-