

southern boundary and make sense of it in applying that word "northward" to anything else than the countries, territories and islands. Suppose you apply it to the banks of the Mississippi, what follows? This follows, and it is the only construction you can use upon this assumption to make the sentence intelligible: that the word "south" applies to the Mississippi as well as the Ohio. If there is a boundary described, it is the southern boundary, for the Mississippi is south of a part of the country. There is a large extent of territory; when you go north to our territory you find that it goes from Thunder Bay to the North-West angle and that territory is bounded on the south by the Mississippi by a line extending from the Baie des Chaleurs to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward, from the banks of the Mississippi as well as from the Ohio to the territories of the Hudson's Bay. Suppose, however, you assume what is perfectly obvious you cannot assume and have an intelligible construction of the section—that the word "northward" applies to the western boundary, then you have no boundary defined on the north. Northward to Hudson's Bay would be simply the north-west point of the western boundary indicated but nothing else. What follows? It follows that the boundary given to the Province of Quebec by the Proclamation of 1763 is still the boundary of that Province. That is not my view, but I apprehend that if the Government are prepared to put so extraordinary a construction upon the Act as the one indicated, that they are going to draw due north a line from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi, which would defeat the object of this Act, and say that the western boundary is limited by that meridian, they must also logically adhere to the other consequences which would follow: and one of these consequences would be that the Province of Quebec has still as its northern boundary the boundary indicated by the Proclamation of 1763. That proclamation draws the northern boundary of Quebec by a line from the source of the St. John River to Lake Nipissing, which line, in many places, approaches near to the St. Lawrence. I observe that the Government of the Province of Quebec is granting lands, promoting settlements north of this boundary line, and within the territories which, according to this view, are still the territories of Canada; that they are granting timber limits, and are receiving moneys for the issue of timber licenses. If the Government are prepared to resist the claims of Ontario, to disregard the decision given by the arbitrators, and withhold from her what I think are her just rights—rights which could be established before any judicial tribunal where the question could be fairly argued and fully considered by the Court—then I say they ought to be prepared to act consistently throughout. I assume that they have been so acting. I assume that they are proceeding upon the principle that there is no boundary line laid down on the north, by the Act of 1874, and that Quebec has still the boundary given to her by the proclamation which has never been changed unless it has been changed by that Act. I assume that that they have not dealt out to Ontario one measure of justice, and another measure of justice to Quebec. I assume that they are disposed to act on certain legal and intelligible principles and are not acting with a view of taking vengeance upon the Government of Ontario by setting aside what was done by their predecessors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is that one would not have supposed, from reading the motion of my hon. friend, that he was going to bring up a discussion on the boundary line. He moved for correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec, in reference to the timber limits north of the boundary of Quebec, as fixed by the Proclamation of October, 1763, and upon that the hon. gentleman has given us a learned

dissertation, not for the first time, on the southern boundary and the western boundary of Quebec, and therefore, he says there must be something wrong about the northern boundary. I think that is rather a *non sequitur*; but if there is any correspondence it will be brought down.

Mr. DAWSON said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) had given what might be an interesting historical sketch, but he failed to see its application to the motion. The hon. gentleman held peculiar views in regard to the boundary, but there was a high authority in Ontario who held very opposite views in some respects. The Attorney-General for Ontario, than whom there was not, perhaps, a more able lawyer in the Dominion, held views the very opposite of those expressed by the hon. member who had just spoken. However, he (Mr. Dawson) observed that the hon. gentleman had another motion referring more particularly to the boundaries of Ontario on the paper, and when it was reached he would offer some remarks on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. In reply to the right hon. gentleman, I would say that I do not think my remarks were irrelevant, for this reason that if the word "northward" is applied to the western boundary there is no boundary described on the north. I do not see how I could bring before the House the probability that that northern boundary might still be in force, except by pointing out the facts which I have brought to the attention of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman's remarks were irrelevant, but they were certainly unexpected.

Motion agreed to.

#### CHAUDIÈRE RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. HAY, in moving for all correspondence, reports and documents relative to the seizure of the bridge iron for the Chaudière Railway Bridge, said: I am in favor of the National Policy, and also in favor of protecting our National Policy. I am satisfied, from what I have seen and heard that, notwithstanding all the precautions taken by the Customs Department, under-valuations of goods coming into this country amount to a very large sum. My motion refers to a gigantic fraud perpetrated within a few hundred yards of this House. I hope the matter will be thoroughly sifted, and the parties implicated treated as the law directs.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the motion passing. The Appraisers at the port of Ottawa having placed a higher value upon the iron than was represented by the invoice, the importer objected and claimed the appointment of experts under the law to value the iron which was imported for the construction of that bridge, those experts are now sitting. As soon as their decision has been given as to the actual value under the law for duty on the iron used in that bridge, I shall be able to complete the return. I can assure my hon. friend that though the importations have been numerous during the summer for the construction of that bridge, the officers in this city have had their eyes upon it the whole time, and it was distinctly understood with the importers that as soon as the importations were completed the proper steps should be taken to ascertain the fair market value of the iron in that bridge for duty. Under the law the importer claimed the right to appoint two experts. Those gentlemen have been appointed, one from Montreal and one from Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:30 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.