

Canada and the United States, and the remarkable admission that the due north line is the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and escape lengthy discussion as to matters not essential.

In order that our descriptive powers may not turn out to be as feeble as those of their Lordships, a map has been prepared to show what it is presumed they meant to hold. By looking at that map and following the red line, it will be seen that the line bounds Ontario on the south from the west of Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods, by the international line, then by the Lake of the Woods and the flow of waters into that lake up to the head waters of Lake Seul, then from the head of Lake Seul to the head of Lake St. Joseph, till it reaches the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and then, so far as Ontario is concerned, it ends. Their Lordships then evidently intend to say that the due north line there struck forms the eastern boundary of Manitoba, so far as that Province goes to the north.

In a most inartistic way, then, they have answered the second question affirmatively and negatively. Affirmatively in this, that Ontario and Manitoba are coterminous from the Lake of the Woods to the point described in Lake St. Joseph; and negatively, that Manitoba does not touch the international line east of the Lake of the Woods, and that Ontario does not go north of the Albany River.

There is still one thing to note, which may perhaps be explained, but which the writer is unable satisfactorily to account for. Why did the judicial committee refer to the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio due north line at all? In no statute is it given as the limits of Manitoba. Is it a coincidence? In the map accompanying the Ontario award papers, Manitoba is brought up to that line. Is there any authority for this; or did their Lordships inhale this with the rest of Mr. Mowat's deftly put propositions?

Let us pass to the real argument. We may now say two propositions constituted the boundary dispute. The one, the due north line from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi. The other, that marked in

red on the accompanying map. There is no longer any question of Mr. Mowat's vague contention of eleven years ago, or of his alternative proposition before the Privy Council. He formally gives up "the point further west," and admits that Ontario has her full share of territory, now that she is only limited to the westward by the system of waters which may be generally described as beginning at the Lake of the Woods, and ending at the mouth of the Albany River.

But how can the red line be defended? It is perfectly clear that by no system of interpretation can it be evolved from the Act of 1774. The only way of making a show of supporting it on the statute was by talking vaguely of a point further west, which might mean the Rocky Mountains or the mouth of the Columbia river. Therefore it is we heard all these semi-intelligent, scattering suggestions, which numerically strong bodies substitute for argument, in ages of unreason.

The arbitrators omitted the opportunity afforded them of telling us how, according to the common sense intelligence of non-professional men, which Sir Francis Hincks so vastly prefers to the narrow refinement of legal training, it was that this ram's horn line became the boundary of Ontario. Less daring than another famous knight, Sir Francis was compelled to give, or seem to give a reason. Let us not deride him by unfair comparison. Falstaff knew not the "Interviewer." Sir Francis was badgered into giving a lecture, semi-autobiographical, and amongst other things he touched on the award. Absolute silence could not, however, have been more mysterious than Sir Francis Hincks' explanation. A popular Minister's first lesson is "how not to do it;" his second, how not to give any information in answering a question. We were therefore told something about a Proclamation and the Act of 1791 which authorized the Proclamation; but not a word to explain by what constitutional process the terms of the statute could be varied by the Proclamation which was to give it effect.

Next, Mr. Attorney-General Mowat had to deal with the argument; but he preferred to talk about it and not to formulate any legal proposition. All this blinking of the ques-