

were simply cited as evidence that whatever territory was covered by them and the accompanying Instructions must necessarily have been included in the old Province; that that would be not only very strong corroborative evidence, but would be actually positive evidence that the territory was so defined and appointed. The hon. the Minister of Justice also referred to the language of the Act of 1774. Now I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman, if he looks at the language employed in that Act, will think that it entirely goes against the interpretation that he put upon it. I do not intend at the present moment to enter upon an argument as to what the boundaries were or were not, nor would I refer to this at all for a moment but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman himself, who took it for granted that northwards from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers must mean due north. Now if you were to make such application of the words westward on the Ohio River, you would never reach the junction of the two rivers at all, because it is not due west, but a very long way off due west, and, if the term westward means along the banks of the Ohio in a westerly direction, it is clearly the case at the same time that the word northward along the banks of the Mississippi must mean the same thing. You cannot interpret the two words in a different way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : "Northward along the banks of the Mississippi" is not in the Act.

MR. MACKENZIE : I am speaking of the word "northward."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : And "along the banks of the Ohio" is not in the Act.

MR. MACKENZIE : But that makes no difference as to the interpretation of the two words, because, if it was meant to be due north the words would be used "due north" not "northward." Why should the word northward be used? Simply because the word westward was used in the sentence immediately preceding? The word northward indicated the line to be taken, and, besides that, the banks of the Mississippi were used in other documents as the boundary which was there described in the Act of 1774 showing that there was no ground whatever for the contention that due north

was the direction intended to be indicated. Another point which the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government made was this. He said: What was to become of the Indian land? The Dominion Government had extinguished the title to lands in a part of this very country covered by these negotiations; were these lands to become the property of Ontario at the expense of the Dominion? he asked. Well, I may ask the hon. gentleman if this is the first case of the kind that has occurred in which lands so situated were dealt with. The hon. gentleman knows it is not. The hon. gentleman has only to search the public documents and he will find that the lands covered by the Robinson Treaty next to the lands he now speaks of, many years ago, are embraced in the definition of the boundaries of Ontario by himself. He knows also that the Dominion of Canada treated these Indian subsidies under the Robinson Treaty as a mere matter of account chargeable against the Province of Ontario, and all the money that the Dominion Government pays out for subsidies to Indians upon land within the territory of Ontario, is to be repaid to the Dominion Government by Ontario. Now, I recollect very well calling Mr. Mowat's attention to this very thing. I have no strong impression, however, of that territory, and I told him that, so far as my personal opinion was concerned, I would rather have the Indian money paid back than have possession of the territory. According to the plan pursued with the land held under the Robinson Treaty, the Dominion Government could have the right to claim the sum of over \$100,000, already paid to the Indians, under Treaty No. 3, that is for the Indian lands east of the line through the centre of the Lake of the Woods; nearly the whole of the lands embraced under that Treaty were embraced also in the territory declared by the Arbitrators to be within the boundaries of Ontario, and we would be entitled for all time to the amount of the annual annuities payable to the Indians, which was something between \$17,000, and \$18,000. The argument, therefore, of the hon. gentleman at the head of Government was without a particle of force in this respect, as we had no difficulty whatever in regard to the transference of claims for the Indian lands. The hon.