

this relation were perfectly founded in fact it is scarcely to be supposed that any one should be so desirous of extending French domination as to insinuate, that because two French Gentlemen travelled through a country, it therefore became the property of France.

But, in truth, a discussion of the right of the king to grant a territory in the occupation of the subjects of another Sovereign, would be perfectly idle, since if such a right under any circumstances could be supposed to exist, it was not on this occasion exerted. The Charter, as appears from the extract already given, grants only such of the lands within the defined limits as were not then, to wit, in 1670, "*actually possessed by, or granted to English subjects, or possessed by the subjects of any other Christian Prince or State.*" In three modes therefore, but in three modes only, it may be shewn, that the territory to the south of Hudson's Bay has not been conveyed by the Charter. One is, that it was in 1760 possessed by or granted to English subjects ; a second is, that it was possessed by the subjects of some other state ; and a third is, that by fair and legal interpretation, it could not be comprehended within the limits of the Grant. It has never been pretended, and it cannot be asserted with truth, that any part of the country in question was granted to or legally possessed by any English subjects prior to the date of the Charter. The second cause of exception, to wit : the possession of the subjects of some other state is next to be considered. In this case as in others of a similar nature, by the