

gation for some time. The information which he acquired, at his elevation to the bench was communicated to Mr. McMahon of London, and to Mr. Monck, a gentleman of Montreal, who were appointed agents and counsel of the Government of Canada, to inform themselves upon this question, and to argue the case, on behalf of Canada, before the Arbitrators. Mr. McMahon collected all the information he could get, and the information so obtained is embraced in the case that was submitted to the Arbitrators on behalf of the Government of Canada. I was myself appointed by the Government of Ontario to report upon the subject in 1872, and again in 1875 to prepare the case. My instructions were to make an exhaustive enquiry into this subject, to collect all the information bearing upon the case, whether it favoured the contention of Ontario or the contention of Canada. That report and case were submitted to the Government of Ontario, and I believe have been put in the possession of the members, or, at all events, a large number of the members of this House. The archives of Paris were searched at the instance of both Governments for information, the public records and state papers at London and other places were examined for information, both on behalf of the Government of Canada, and of the Government of Ontario, and all the knowledge it was possible to glean, was obtained at that time. There were a few documents referred to in various communications, as, for instance, the map referred to in a communication to Lord Bolingbroke, of Mr. Prior, who was Acting British Minister at Paris. This map was searched for both at Paris and London, but could not be found. Now, Sir, I do not believe that a Committee such as the one asked for would be a proper instrument for obtaining additional information. I do not believe there is any additional information to be obtained. If you take the cases of the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada, they will give you all the information you want on the subject. If the gentlemen on the Treasury Benches believe that further information can be obtained, and that it is necessary to get it, they should appoint competent gentlemen who must be sent to London and to Paris to get what further information, if any, can be obtained.

But there is one thing certain that, there is no information which the Committee can get that is not already in the possession of the House, or which the House cannot have if the case for the Government of Ontario and the case for the Government of Canada are brought down to the House. I do not wish to discuss this question on its merits. I purpose doing so when the Bill which I intend to submit is brought before the House for the second reading. That will be a more convenient time. The hon. member for Algoma has alluded to some Acts of Parliament and certain other matters which he says have been overlooked by the Arbitrators. Among these Arbitrators, there was Sir Francis Hincks, a gentleman of rank, one well versed in public affairs; there was Chief Justice Harrison, a distinguished jurist, and Sir Edward Thornton. These gentlemen were quite able to appreciate the facts to which the hon. gentleman has referred. The Acts of 1803 and 1821 have no bearing on this question. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the King's Proclamation of 1763, and he says that certain territories are there spoken of as Indian territories. These words are perfectly intelligible; no difference of opinion could exist in reference to them. The King, in the exercise of his prerogative, agreed with France in the Treaty of 1763 that the Mississippi river should be the boundary on the west, and the King, in further exercise of his prerogative, parcelled out of the ceded territory a Province called the Province of Quebec, which corresponded very much to the present Province of Quebec. All the territory lying west of that Province was Indian territory—including Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana,—and the Indians in it were placed under the supervision of Sir William Johnston. The hon. gentleman has said that the western boundary of the Province of Ontario or Upper Canada was the meridian line from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. I do not believe it is possible, after looking into the facts of this question, to come to that conclusion—either from the grammatical construction of the preamble of the Act of 1774, or from the circumstances which led to that Act. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Act of 1774, he will find that it refers to the portion of New France