States and in what manner "— submitted a report on the 18th of December. It found that the boundaries had been infringed, on many sides, as charged, among the specifications being:

"Second. By the act of June 15, 1836, for the admission of Michigan into the Union, by which the Montreal and the Menomonee rivers are declared to be the northeastern boundary of Wisconsin."

In reference to this charge the committee asserted, as Governor Doty had, that there is not a natural boundary between the two rivers. "Such a boundary [as enacted] violates, if not the words, at least the spirit and intent of the ordinance." Further: "If the country [the northern peninsulal should become inhabited, as it now is to some extent, and as it is reasonable to suppose it soon will be to a much greater, the convenience of its inhabitants would be much better consulted by uniting them with Wisconsin than with Their facilities of intercourse with Wisconsin would be much greater, and they would enjoy their civil and political rights to a much greater extent by being united with a people to whom at all times they would be contiguous, than by being connected with those from whom all communication would be absolutely cut off nearly half the year."

The committee concludes that the northeast boundary is still open, as that which congress "attempted to establish violates the spirit, intent and fair construction of the ordinance," and "should not be established as the permanent boundary between the two states." The committee, however, confesses itself of the opinion that although Michigan had the northern peninsula thrust upon her against her solemn protests, "it is not in the nature of political communities to surrender any rights, especially rights of territory, to which any circumstances have given them the color of claim, and it is not reasonable to expect that Michigan will voluntarily surrender to us any claims she may have to territory west of Lake Michigan derived by virtue of the act admitting her to the Union."

¹ Council Jour., Wis. Terr. Legis., 1844, document D.