

Quebec as fixed by the Royal Proclamation of October, 1763, said: My reason for moving for this correspondence is, that the Government apparently intend to take a particular line with regard to the demand made with reference to the boundaries of the Province of Ontario. It is well known that the late Administration had the question in dispute between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Ontario, in reference to the boundary, submitted to arbitration. It was not a matter of high public policy; it was simply a departmental matter. There was no proposition that a conventional boundary should be established. The arbitrators had simply to ascertain where the law places the boundary between Ontario and the territories of the Dominion. The Government of that period came to the House and asked for an appropriation for the purpose of enabling them to give effect to the arbitration. The House voted the necessary money. No gentleman on the other side took any exception to the course proposed. The investigation was carried on, the arbitrators sat and an award was made; and from that hour to this the present Administration, who succeeded us, have not seen proper to submit to the House an Act for the purpose of giving effect to that decision. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues have not seen fit to recognize the principle of continuity in Government. They have not felt themselves called upon to give effect in this particular to what, as it seems to me, the good faith between Ontario and the Dominion required at their hands. A Committee was appointed last year to further investigate this question. The Committee, too, hurriedly reported; and, in my opinion, the report exhibited many omissions, misapprehensions and departures from what would be recognized by competent authority as correct principles of interpretation. But the Committee came to the conclusion that, under the provisions of the Quebec Act, of 1774, the western limit of Quebec was a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi. I have myself given a good deal of attention to the consideration of this subject, and cannot understand how it was possible to put such a construction upon the words of the Imperial Statute.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him. The Committee analyzed the evidence, but gave no decision on that particular point.

Mr. MILLS. The impression I have expressed was what, apparently, the report was intended to convey; and it certainly was the opinion expressed by the majority of the Committee. I now wish to call the attention of the House to some historical facts. Hon. gentlemen, who have looked into the early history of this continent, know very well that, for a long time, a considerable stretch of territory, lying between the basin of the Alleghanies and the great lakes that belong to the system of the St. Lawrence, was in dispute between the Government of France and the Government of Great Britain; but in 1755 the question was discussed, and the River Ohio proposed as a compromise between the claims of the respective countries. The Government of Great Britain agreed to accept the Ohio as the boundary if the French would consent to destroy the forts lying along that river and retire from that river to and beyond the lakes. This they declined to do, and each Government stood upon its extreme rights. We know that by the surrender of Canada, within the chartered limits of the French territory known as Canada, the whole country north of the Ohio and Mississippi and westward to the Rocky Mountains, was included in the Government of Canada, with the exception of the country known as the Illinois country, which lay between the Wabash on the east, the Mississippi on the west, and the Ohio on the south; that, after the fall of the city of Quebec, when the Governor of Quebec, surrendered it to Sir G. Amherst, a boundary was indicated on the map left in the possession of Col.

Haldimand, and that the boundary on the west was the line along the highlands that separated the Mississippi from Lake Michigan. That boundary was the subject of dispute between the French representative in Great Britain and Mr. Pitt. The result was that the negotiations with a view to peace were broken off, in consequence of this failure. Subsequently, under negotiations carried on by the Duke of Bedford, the territories west of the Mississippi, and which had been claimed as part of the French territory known as Canada, was retained by France as far north as the sources of the Mississippi, and were included in what was called the Louisiana country, and that portion of Louisiana called the Illinois country to the east of the Mississippi was included in the territories of Canada surrendered to the Government of Great Britain. So, if hon. gentlemen look at the terms of the Treaty of 1763, they will see that while Canada was limited on the west by the Mississippi, to its source, that all that country known as Canada, when you reach a higher latitude, extending to the Rocky Mountains, was surrendered by France to Great Britain; and among the papers of Lord Shelburne, in the Lansdown manuscripts, published within a year or two, a map has been published indicating the territory I have mentioned, known as Canada, and surrendered to Great Britain. Throughout the Quebec Act of 1774, although it is an Act constituting the Province of Quebec, there is another Province spoken of, the Province of Canada indicating the territory that had been surrendered to Great Britain, by France, under the Treaty of 1763. Shortly after this surrender, the King issued a proclamation for the purpose of dealing, not only with this territory, but with certain West India Islands, also surrendered, and, by his prerogative authority, he constituted the Government of Quebec. He carved out of the Province of Canada, the Province of Quebec, in which certain limits were set forth. The remaining portion of the territory was left without any organized Government. Difficulties arose between the scattered French settlements, in what was known as the Territory of Canada, and the traders of the old British Colonies. The question was frequently under the consideration of the Indian Department of the North, then presided over by Sir William Johnston, and frequent communications took place between him and the Lords of Trade and Plantations in reference to this country, and the best mode of governing it. It was found that English traders frequently made incursions into the country; that they purchased supplies from the Indians, and were disposed to purchase property from them at various points in this country. It was the policy of the English Government not to permit settlement to extend beyond the limits which the King had assigned to the country opened for settlement in this very proclamation. It was stated by the Lords of Trade and Plantations, to Lord Shelburne, who was well known to have been a free-trader, and anxious to favor settlement, and who proposed several new colonies in this district, one of which was to be established at Pittsburgh, and another in the Illinois country, that if the settlers were sent far into the interior the products of the colony would not reach the English market; that England had spent a large sum for the protection of the colonies against the French and the Indians, and it was desirable that they should be settled in such positions as would enable the English to profit by their industry. They favored the settlement of Nova Scotia to prevent its reconquest by France, and the settlement of Florida to prevent its reconquest by Spain. The chief of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Lord Hillsborough, favored the expulsion of the French from this territory. There were two French colonies, two villages, each containing several hundred inhabitants on the Wabash, there were some four or five thousand French people settled on the eastern bank of the Mississippi River, and a proclamation was issued