

“ streights as would give the Lands spoken of *a sort of affi-*
 “ *nity or relation* to Hudson’s Streights, and not to lands
 “ commencing at the distance of 900 miles, and extending
 “ 2000 miles therefrom—that is to say, of the Coasts and
 “ Confines of the Seas, &c. within the Streights; such a
 “ boundary must be implied as is consistent with that view,
 “ and with the professed objects of a trading Company, in-
 “ tending not to found Kingdoms and establish States, but to
 “ carry on fisheries in those waters, and to traffic for the
 “ acquisition of Furs and Peltries, and the other articles
 “ mentioned in the Charter. The enormous extension of
 “ Land and Territory now claimed, appears therefore to us
 “ not to be warranted by any sound construction of the
 “ Charter.

“ Indeed there is sufficient reason to suppose that the
 “ Territories in question or part of them, had been then vi-
 “ sited, traded in, and in a certain degree occupied by the
 “ French Traders from Canada, and their Beaver Company
 “ erected in 1630, whose trade in Peltries were considera-
 “ bly prior to the date of the Charter of the Hudson’s Bay
 “ Company. These Territories therefore would be excepted
 “ out of the Grant; and the Right of British Subjects in
 “ general, to visit and trade in those Regions would follow
 “ the national rights acquired by the King, by the Conquest
 “ and Cession of Canada, as enjoyed by the French Cana-
 “ dians, previous to that Conquest and Cession.”