

on the British side north of 49 degrees; if there were, the country would be as thickly peopled as it is south. Mr. W. Kerzington.

2228. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] How do you know that; what are your means of information?—The talk of the people; there are likely to be disturbances in that country the same as in Kansas if the country is not made free under Kansas. 5 March 1857.

2229. That is also the talk of the people?—Yes.

2230. Mr. *Bell*.] Do you know any individuals who would go into that country to settle if they were not prevented by the exclusive system of the Hudson's Bay Company?—I know a great many people in Chicago who talk of settling at the Red River, provided it was under Canadian rule.

2231. Americans?—Americans.

2232. Mr. *Grogan*.] Have you at Chicago ever had any commercial dealings with, or come across any of the parties who come from the Red River and that district with their goods?—I myself have not had.

2233. But do you, of your own knowledge, know whether any of the settlers of the Red River seek a market for their goods in the American territory?—I know that last season 500 waggoners left Pembina with their pork, their beef, their lard, their wheat, and all their agricultural produce, and sold it at St. Paul's or St. Peter's, and brought back the goods which they required.

2234. That is the circumstance which you mentioned to us on the last day?—Yes.

2235. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] They did so, as far as you know, without any obstruction on the part of the Hudson's Bay Company?—The Hudson's Bay Company were not powerful enough to stop them.

2236. Do you know whether they tried to stop them?—That is the talk of the country.

2237. Mr. *Kinnaird*.] The talk of the country is a very general sort of term; can you give us any fact showing the views of the Company?—No, I can give you no fact, but I think the best proof is that north of 49 degrees there is no settlement; south of 49 degrees, in Minnesota, there are now 180,000 settlers. That district had a population four years ago of 6,000 people; it has now 180,000. Red River had as large a population 20 years ago as it has now; I think that is a fact which is proof enough.

2238. Do you say that the land round Red River in that whole district is equally well adapted for settlement as the Minnesota district?—So it has been stated to me.

2239. You do not know it?—I do not know it personally.

2240. Mr. *Grogan*.] You have never been there?—Never. The chief settlers in Minnesota are Norwegians and Swedes, and those people would as soon be under Canadian rule as under American, and they would cross the border if allowed.

2241. Mr. *Kinnaird*.] They would cross the border if encouragement was given?—Yes.

2242. Mr. *Bell*.] How near to the border have they settled?—Very close up.

2243. St. Paul's is 200 to 250 miles from the border?—Every year they are closing further and further.

2244. Mr. *Adderley*.] Do you know the country of Minnesota?—No, I have not been further north than Dubuque, in Iowa.

2245. Mr. *Gardner*.] How do you know that the settlements are closing up to the British boundary?—I know that those people would as soon be under Canadian rule as under American.

2246. That is not my question. You said that you knew that the American settlers were settling up close to the British boundary; how do you know that?—From common report. There was a lecture delivered in Chicago; I will enclose it to the Chairman; it may give some information.

The Honourable *Charles William Wentworth Fitzwilliam*, a Member of the Committee; Examined.

2247. *Chairman*.] I BELIEVE you have recently passed some time in British North America?—It is three years since I came back from America. In the winter of 1852-3 I was in Oregon and Vancouver's Island.

Hon. C. W. F. Fitzwilliam, M.P.

Hon. C. F. F.
Fitzwilliam, M.P.

5 March 1857.

2248. How long did you remain in Vancouver's Island?—I was there two months; the months of March and April.

2249. What opinion did you form of the soil and climate of that island, and of its capabilities for becoming a place of settlement for Europeans?—The climate appeared to me particularly adapted for settlement by Englishmen. It seemed to resemble very much the climate of England, though perhaps in winter not so cold as it is here; and in summer, from a letter which I have just received, it must be considerably hotter. The soil is generally productive, although in places rocky; the country is divided into wood and prairie country; the prairies are parklike; extensive grounds, stretching into the wood.

2250. Did you go much about the island?—I was up as far as Nanaimo, where there is a coal mine, about 80 miles to the north of Fort Victoria, on the east side of the island; and I was about ten miles on the coast to the west.

2251. Did you hear much about the coal mines there, so as to form any opinion as to their probable productiveness?—When I was there they were working a six feet seam of coal at a depth of about 40 feet; it was close on the shore; within 20 yards of the shore.

2252. It is on the eastern shore of Vancouver's Island, I believe?—Yes.

2253. Is there not an easy communication by means of a valley that almost cuts the island in two, from the place where the coal mines are to a good harbour on the western side of Vancouver's Island?—I do not believe that that country has ever been explored; but I should imagine there was from Nanaimo across to Nittinat Sound.

2254. Sir John Pakington.] Which part did you say had not been explored?—Hardly any of the interior of the island has been explored.

2255. I understood you to speak of the west coast not having been explored?—On the west coast, I believe, it has not been explored; at least it had not been then.

2256. Chairman.] Was the timber fine in the part of the country that you saw?—The fir timber was magnificent.

2257. The harbours are excellent, are they not?—Yes; the Esquimault harbour is the finest harbour I ever saw.

2258. Mr. Grogan.] Is that on the east side, or the west?—All the country I am now speaking of is within the Straits of Fuco.

2259. Chairman.] What opinion have you of that country with regard to its resources, as to fisheries?—Nobody who has not seen the enormous quantity of fish can possibly credit the value and extent of the fisheries. I do not know the number of barrels, but many thousand barrels of salt salmon are sent annually from Victoria to the Hudson's Bay Company's depôt at the Sandwich Islands.

2260. Do the neighbouring seas abound with other fish, besides salmon?—Herrings are very numerous indeed. To give some idea of how numerous they are, the method of catching herrings is, that two Indians go in a canoe, one paddling in the stern and the other standing in the bow. The Indian in the bow has a lath of wood about eight or nine feet long, studded with nails. He scoops down into the water and impales the fish on those nails. In two or three hours they get a fair load in the canoe.

2261. In what condition did you find the settlement which is now there, as far as you could judge?—It was in a very primitive state. There were no roads except those made immediately round the fort, and one from the head of Esquimault harbour to Captain Langford's house. Captain Langford is the bailiff, I believe, for the Puget Sound Farming Company.

2262. Did much advance seem to have taken place in colonising or settling the country?—Comparatively speaking, very little. On the other side of Puget Sound, on the mainland in Oregon, where I believe it had only been settled two or three years before the island was granted to the Company, there were farms of considerable extent.

2263. Are you speaking of the American country?—Yes; from what is now Columbia City, or Fort Vancouver, all the way across to Olympia, at the head of Puget Sound. Of course the farms were not continuous; in a country like that you do not find farms, as we do in England, one touching the other.

2264. Did you travel through that country on the American side from Fort
Vancouver

Vancouver to Olympia?—I travelled by canoe from Fort Vancouver to the Cowlets, and then across from there to Olympia and to Nisqually.

2265. There are a good many Indians, I believe, in Vancouver's Island?—On the coast of the island; there are none in the interior; they inhabit the coast entirely; they are fishing Indians, and live on fish and potatoes.

2266. Do they live in no degree upon hunting?—I believe not; they have very few offensive weapons; no bows or arrows, and I believe, generally speaking, no guns.

2267. They are not a warlike race then at all?—They are, to a certain extent, warlike; they make war in canoes, but I think they generally fight hand to hand, and not with missiles.

2268. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Do you know the Cowichan valley?—The Cowichan valley is about 40 miles from Fort Victoria, on the east coast; the Cowichan Bay is a deep bay with, at the extreme end of the bay, low land, and on the north side are high mountains; it must be a very productive valley indeed, from the great quantities of potatoes which I saw traded there by the Company and by other trades when I was there.

2269. You were not in the valley?—No; when I was there it was almost dangerous to land there; it was just after the execution of two Indians for murder.

2270. *Chairman*.] Do you know what was the number of the European community settled in Vancouver's Island when you were there?—I do not know exactly, but I should think that the numbers of Europeans and half-breeds, considering them all as white men, were about 300.

2271. Did you hear any causes assigned for the number of settlers there having increased so little?—I think one principal cause is the distance at which it is from the mother country.

2272. Did you hear the attractions of California, as a gold-producing country, assigned at all as a reason for their not having increased more?—I think all those who got up as far north as Vancouver's Island would not turn south and go to San Francisco, but they would be more likely to go over to the main land, which they could do very easily in canoes, where they would get as much employment as they could want at very remunerative wages.

2273. Would not settlers who are in doubt where to go, who might have been induced to go to Vancouver's Island, have gone to California on account of the gold?—I do not think that a sufficient number crosses the equator in that direction for me to form any opinion upon that subject.

2274. Did you travel about any other part of North America?—I was all through the States on the Missouri river, as far as Port Pierre. I crossed the Rocky Mountains twice, and was in California, and also in New Mexico.

2275. You were not in the territory managed by the Hudson's Bay Company?—No; not north of the Boundary Line.

2276. Mr. *Kinnaird*.] You stated that the interior of Vancouver's Island had never been explored at all; did you ascertain whether there was any systematic attempt to arrive at a knowledge of the nature of the country by the Government there?—I do not think that there was any systematic attempt.

2277. Do you not consider it very desirable that an island of that importance should be, in a certain measure, surveyed?—Certainly I do; for I think it is the most valuable possession in the Pacific. If you take the map of the Pacific you will see that the only safe harbours in the Pacific exist in Vancouver's Island, with perhaps the exception of Acapulco and San Francisco. The entrance to the harbour in the Columbia River is excessively dangerous, and ships are frequently detained there even for weeks in the winter time.

2278. Had Captain Longford never made any attempt to explore the island?—Only immediately round his house.

2279. Did he express a desire that he should have powers given him for that purpose; did he think it necessary himself?—Yes, I think the colonists generally wished that some exploration of the country should be made.

2280. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Was not Captain Grant there when you were there?—Not then; he had left a little before.

2281. Do you know that he was appointed by the Colonial Government in concert with the Government here as the surveyor of the island for the purpose of surveying it?—I do not know that he was. I forget the name of the gentleman who was surveyor to the Company then.

Hon. C. W. F.
Fitzwilliam, &c.
 5 March 1857.

2282. There was a surveyor to the Company then?—Yes.

2283. *Mr. Kinnaird.*] You stated that there was a considerable difficulty in landing at a certain point, owing to the excitement among the Indians?—That was in Cowichan Bay.

2284. Which is part of Vancouver's Island?—Yes.

2285. What were the circumstances which rendered your landing dangerous?—A short time before I arrived there, a Cowichan and a Nanimo Indian had killed either one or two shepherds.

2286. Europeans?—Yes; I believe they were Europeans. Mr. Douglas, aided by Captain Kuper, of the "Thetis," took these men, and they were tried and hung for the murder; they were hung at Nanimo.

2287. That created great excitement among the other Indians?—Yes.

2288. And it was considered not safe at that time to land?—I certainly did not think it safe myself, because, if I had landed, I should have had to land alone; and as I could not speak Cowichan, and those Indians did not understand signs, I did not wish to risk myself there.

2289. Have any attempts been made, as far as you know, for the civilization or instruction of these natives?—I think none.

2290. Have you heard of any missionary being on the island at all?—Mr. Stains, the chaplain to the Company, was then on the island, and there was a Roman Catholic bishop.

2291. You are not aware that any means were being used, or that any schools were in existence; there was no settlement of Indians there?—The Indians there live in permanent villages; they are not a migratory tribe like those on the main land, but they live in villages on the shore.

2292. You would, therefore, consider that it would be easier to provide for their instruction, than it would be in the case of the wandering Indians?—I think so.

2293. *Chairman.*] Are they employed on the coal mines at all?—No.

2294. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] Vancouver's Island is about as large as England, is it not?—I should think it is as long as England proper, but not so wide.

2295. *Sir John Pakington.*] Is Victoria the only European settlement there?—Yes, the only town.

2296. Do the 300 English and half-breeds, of whom you spoke, reside at Victoria?—No, not all; some of them reside on farms in the neighbourhood.

2297. Am I right in presuming that those farms are in the neighbourhood of Victoria?—All within 12 miles of it.

2298. Substantially, there is only one English settlement in Vancouver's Island?—Exactly so.

2299. Is that English settlement of Victoria situated upon the very fine harbour of which you have spoken?—No, not exactly on it; it is situated on a small harbour which runs in a little to the east of Esquimaux; going by land it is within a mile and a half of the harbour.

2300. To what extent did you yourself obtain any personal knowledge of Vancouver's Island?—I was at the coal mines at Nanimo.

2301. How far are they from Victoria?—They are about 80 miles, on the east coast.

2302. I apprehend that those coal mines practically constitute a settlement, do they not?—Yes. I forgot the settlement at the coal mines.

2303. What is the number of Europeans who are settled at the coal mines? I do not believe there were more than 10 when I was there.

2304. What was the aggregate population there?—I do not believe there were more than 10 persons all together at the coal mines.

2305. Do you mean that the coal mines are worked by 10 persons?—There were only four men then working in the mine.

2306. Without the assistance of any Indians or half-breed?—Yes, except one or two just to wind up the coal.

2307. How far from the coast is the coal mine at Nanimo?—Twenty yards.

2308. Then the coals are all conveyed by sea, of course?—Yes; a 500 ton ship can come within 10 yards of the shore; within 40 yards of the mouth of the pit.

2309. On which coast is Nanimo?—On the east coast.

2310. Within the straits?—Yes; all the country I am speaking of is within the Straits of Fuco.

2311. Are

2311. Are those straits throughout easy of navigation; is it a pretty bold, safe coast; say from Victoria to Nanaimo, is it a safe navigation?—It is rather an intricate navigation, for it is through a cluster of islands the way I went, by canoe and steam-boat.

2312. You have spoken of a 500 ton ship; is the water deep?—Yes.

2313. Is there any difficulty in navigating a 500 ton ship from Victoria to Nanaimo?—Not with propelling power.

2314. Do you know the total number of Indians in Vancouver's Island?—No.

2315. I understood you to state that they were peaceable, and for the most part unarmed?—I should say they are for the most part unarmed. I do not believe in the peaceableness of any Indian.

2316. Will you explain that answer?—I believe that any Indian will take any and every advantage he possibly can.

2317. What I mean rather is, not whether as an uncivilised man he would take advantage, but whether the Indians of Vancouver's Island have evinced any disposition to be aggressive towards the European settlers, or whether they have lived peaceably with the European settlers?—I think, generally speaking, they have lived peaceably with them, as far as I can understand.

2318. They are not what you would comparatively speak of as a savage tribe of Indians?—No; they are not to be compared with the Blackfeet.

2319. Mr. Bell.] From what you say the coal mines are not at all in active operation?—No; they were not when I was there.

2320. Mr. Edward Ellice.] Of what time do you speak with reference to that coal?—1853.

2321. Are you aware that very shortly after the coal was discovered there was an intention shown to begin to work it?—Yes.

2322. Are you not aware that there are now 60 or 70 miners employed?—I am not sure; but when I was there I know that miners were expected out, in the "Otter," I think.

2323. Mr. Gordon.] What class of persons were the settlers of whom you have been talking; were they persons who had come from England, or persons who had settled there from America; had any come from the opposite coast?—I think very few; some Americans had come for job work.

2324. Where had the white population, such as it was, come from?—From England, generally speaking.

2325. What inducements had brought those English settlers out there?—Several had come out as servants of the Puget Sound Farming Company, and were acting as bailiffs and servants on that farm; they had been brought out in the Company's ships.

2326. You do not think, then, that any of the settlers there had come out attracted by the advantages of the island itself; they had come out, as it were, accidentally in some capacity, and then they remained there?—I think only one had come out to settle.

2327. Was any encouragement given to settlers to come; was there any effort made to induce other settlers to come?—I think not.

2328. Mr. Edward Ellice.] You do not know that to be the fact?—No.

2329. Mr. Gordon.] Do you happen to know at what price land was procured there?—Land was sold at 1*l.* an acre, according to the assignment of the island to the Company by the Government. The Company received 10 per cent. of that, and the remaining 90 per cent. was to be expended in the improvement of the island.

2330. Do you know when that coal mine of which you have spoken was first discovered?—At the end of 1852, I think.

2331. Have you often travelled with American fur traders?—Yes.

2332. Have you had any opportunity of observing whether they, in their traffic with the Indians, make great use of spirituous liquors as a means of barter?—I think, generally speaking, they do not use liquors.

2333. Is there any penalty in force if it is proved that they have made use of them?—A very heavy one.

2334. Have you ever seen that heavy penalty practically enforced?—I cannot say that I have seen it; but I have heard that a man whom I wished to employ had been detected trading in liquor, and had been taken down from Fort Laramy on the Plat to the States.

Hon. C. H. W.
Fitzsimons, M. P.

5 March 1857.

2335. As a prisoner?—As a prisoner.
2336. Chained?—I believe so.
2337. Then do you believe that that regulation is practically carried out?—I think it is, where they have the power to do so.
2338. Mr. *Percy Herbert*.] You spoke of the anchorage; that ships of 500 tons could lie off the coal mine?—Yes.
2339. Is that a secure and extensive anchorage?—It is not an extensive anchorage exactly opposite the coal mine; it is perfectly secure, and within a quarter of a mile of it there is anchorage for any number of ships that choose to go there.
2340. Is the supply of coal supposed to be very large?—It had not been explored very much when I was there, but they were then working a six-foot seam, which seemed to descend into the ground instead of rising to the surface.
2341. Viscount *Sandon*.] I think there are some islands between Vancouver's Island and the mainland?—Yes.
2342. Have you been on them?—I have camped on some of them.
2343. Are they capable of cultivation?—Yes, I think so.
2344. They are just at the mouth of the harbour, I think, opposite Victoria?—They are not at the mouth of the harbour.
2345. Just opposite?—Not opposite the mouth of the harbour; they are to the back of the harbour.
2346. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Are not those the islands now in dispute between the American Government and our own?—Yes.
2347. Mr. *Adderley*.] Can you tell us anything about the administration of the island, the government, or the magistracy?—There was a governor appointed by the home Government, Mr. Douglas, and he had a council of five to aid him in the government of the island.
2348. Is he at all under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company?—He is a chief factor in the Company.
2349. Was he appointed by the Company?—No; not by the Company, but at the suggestion of the Company.
2350. What are the magistracy, or how is the law enforced there?—Mr. Douglas appointed magistrates. I do not know exactly whether they enforced the law as it would be enforced in England, but they made some attempt to do so.
2351. There are tribunals in the island in case of breaches of the law?—The offenders are brought up before the magistrates whenever such a case occurs.
2352. Have the Company done anything by way of settling the land?—I do not think that the Hudson's Bay Company itself actually has, but the Puget Sound Farming Company, which is composed of members of the Hudson's Bay Company, has taken out settlers there, and has cultivated a considerable quantity of land.
2353. Is that Puget Sound Company entirely merged in the Hudson's Bay Company, or is it a separate Company?—It is a separate Company, I believe, composed altogether of members of the Hudson's Bay Company; that is how it was explained to me.
2354. So that the whole of the Puget Sound Company is merged in the Hudson's Bay Company?—Yes; all the members of it are officers of the Hudson's Bay Company.
2355. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] You do not state that as a fact, do you?—I was informed so.
2356. Mr. *Adderley*.] Do the Company occupy lands as belonging to themselves besides the land which they have sold?—I think they had a few fields in cultivation close to the fort for their own supplies.
2357. Are the public buildings at the harbours, and the wharfs, and so on, retained by the Company as their own property?—There are no public buildings, and no wharfs, but those which belong to the Company.
2358. Do the Company claim a royalty upon the mines?—Yes. I am speaking of 1853.
2359. Do you know whether they are taking any steps whatever to advertise immigrants?—I have never seen any advertisement of the sort.
2360. You talked of a surveyor being appointed: how did it come to pass that

that that surveyor was appointed, and yet that no survey took place?—He seemed to me to be mostly engaged in determining the latitude and longitude at different points of the island, which was most useless for the benefit of the colonists.

2361. Was he paid by the Company?—Yes.

2362. From what quarter do you think that the settlement of that country will naturally come: from the sea side or from the land side? Supposing it was perfectly free for colonisation, and that there were no rights of the Hudson's Bay Company acting as any obstacle to emigration from any portion of the world, do you think it likely that it would be settled gradually from the sea, or that a population would grow up from the United States to it?—I think that in all probability it would be settled from the sea; that emigrants would sail from here.

2363. Do you know that portion of the United States called Columbia?—I have been through the Washington and Oregon territories; there are very few roads there, and most of the communication is by water.

2364. Does the population at all increase in that direction?—Vastly.

2365. Towards the borders?—Yes, up along the shores of Puget Sound, by Nisqually.

2366. Is there any speculation in those fisheries of which you spoke, farther than the mere fishing in canoes; is there any appearance of companies being formed, for the purpose of speculating in those fisheries?—None whatever. The Hudson's Bay Company traded the fish from the Indians, and annually sent down a great deal of salt fish to their depot at the Sandwich Islands.

2367. Do the Company claim a monopoly of that fishery; do they claim the exclusive right of fishery upon the coasts of Vancouver's Island?—They do not fish themselves; the Indians are the fishermen, and they trade their fish to the Company.

2368. Have the Company a monopoly in that trade?—No, I should not say that they have a monopoly there, for when I was at Cowichan there was an opposition going on at the time.

2369. From what quarter was it?—A settler on the island, a Mr. Cooper, was trading then. I think he had got some goods up from San Francisco, and he was trading to San Francisco at the time.

2370. Mr. Grogan.] In fish?—Mostly in lumber to San Francisco.

2371. Mr. Adderley.] Was Mr. Cooper a man who had purchased land from the Company?—Yes, he had a farm there; he had about 15 acres in cultivation then, and would, I dare say, before the year was out, double that.

2372. Do you know Nootka Sound?—No.

2373. I suppose, that is a notoriously fine harbour;—I believe so.

2374. Can you state what is the nature of the coal which you have seen; is it a good coal?—It is an excellent coal, very like the West Riding of Yorkshire coal.

2375. And that is a vein very near the surface?—Yes.

2376. Mr. Grogan.] What did you say were the productions that the settlers were raising when you were there; you spoke of the Indians raising a great quantity of potatoes; was corn reared?—Wheat was raised.

2377. Was it a safe crop?—Yes, I believe so.

2378. Were there any other cereal crops besides wheat?—Oats and barley.

2379. Have you any doubt whatever that they would grow there just as well as they do in these climates?—None whatever.

2380. Chairman.] In short, it is a very fine soil and climate, is it not?—Yes.

2381. Sir John Pakington.] At what time of the year were you there?—In March and April.

2382. Mr. Grogan.] Were there any number of settlers who had purchased land from the Company, or was Mr. Cooper an isolated case?—I think Mr. Cooper was an isolated case; he was in partnership with a farmer, Mr. Blenkhorn, who was by far the most energetic settler on the island; he was a man who had been in Australia for several years, and afterwards came back to England, and then went out with Mr. Cooper to the island.

2383. In fact there are no number of settlers going there, or in the island at present?—No, except those who are brought out by the Puget Sound Company.

Hon. C. W. F.
Fitzwilliam, &c.
5 March 1857.

2384. The settlers whom you have described to us, and those in and about Fort Victoria, were all the servants or attachés of the Puget Sound Company, were not they?—Do you mean immediately about the fort, because the settlement is very small?

2385. You describe, that besides the fort, taking a radius of 10 or 12 miles round the fort, there were a good number of settlements where cultivation was going on?—Yes.

2386. I call that the settlement generally; were they principally the servants of the Puget Sound Company, or was there any body of independent settlers?—Mr. Cooper was the only free settler, as they term it there, on the island.

2387. The only independent settler?—The only independent settler; all the others were connected either with the Hudson's Bay Company or with the Puget Sound Company; many of the officers of the Company had bought farms, and were cultivating them.

2388. Mr. *Adderley*.] Had they paid the Company?—I do not know whether money had passed or not.

2389. Do you know whether there were cases of the Company allotting land free of price to their officers?—I cannot answer that question.

2390. *Chairman*.] Is there anything which you wish to add to the evidence you have given?—I wish to hand in the following letter which I received from Mr. Cooper.

[*The same was delivered in, and is as follows:*]

Sir, Victoria, Vancouver's Island, 21 February 1852.
I use to hand you a copy of my letter to Captain Kuper, c. s. (Her Majesty's ship "Thetis"). Also accompanying it, is the document alluded to.

Honourable C. W. Westworth Fitzwilliam.

I have, &c.
(signed) James Cooper.

Sir, Victoria, Vancouver's Island, 3 January 1852.
ENCLOSED is a document I beg leave to forward for your inspection, and as one of the many instances of injustice that we are compelled to submit to.

The two men whose signatures appear in the document were under contract to cut and square wood, to complete the cargo of the vessel lying in this port countersigned to me. The governor compelling them to join in the expedition now absent (though perfectly cognizant of their engagement), leaving me with an impossibility of replacing them, consequently the vessel is detained here much longer than she otherwise would be, under almost ruinous circumstances.

It is not necessary for me to make any comment upon the above further than this: that it possibly may be legal, but it is not either just or generous.

Captain A. L. Kuper, c. s.,
H. M. S. "Thetis."

I have, &c.
(signed) James Cooper.

Victoria, December 1852.
I HEREBY solemnly swear that Mr. Douglas compelled me to join in the expedition now about to take place on the coast of this island, under penalty of being banished from the colony. The threats held out were in these words: "If any man is afraid to go, he may stop, but must leave the island."

Witness, James Cooper.
" Thomas Cooper.

his
Basil x Batimeon.
mark.
his
Charles x
mark.

Mr. Alexander Isister, called in; and Examined.

Mr. A. Isister.

2391. *Chairman*.] I BELIEVE you have directed your attention for some time past very much to the affairs of the Hudson's Bay Company?—I have.

2392. What is your personal connexion with that country?—I am a native of that country, and passed the greater portion of the first 20 years of my life in that territory.

2393. Were

2393. Were you ever in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company?—For about three years.

2394. Where were you when you were engaged in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company?—In the district called the Mackenzie's River district; the most northerly district.

2395. In what capacity?—I was a clerk, or a postmaster, a junior officer in the Hudson's Bay Company's service.

2396. In what year was that?—In the years 1838, 1839, and 1840, I think; I am not quite sure of the date; but it was about that time.

2397. What induced you to leave the service of the Hudson's Bay Company?—I wished to come to England to complete my education; I was desirous of obtaining a University education, and of qualifying myself for a profession.

2398. You did not leave the service of the Company in consequence of any dispute?—Not by any means; I had no dispute at all with the Hudson's Bay Company, and have no personal complaint whatever against them.

2399. When did you return to that country?—I have not been back since.

2400. You were born there, and as a child you lived there?—Yes.

2401. What was your age when you left?—I was very young; under 20.

2402. In what year did you leave?—To the best of my recollection about 1841, I think; I am not quite sure; or 1842; it is many years since I left the territory.

2403. During the whole of those three years for which you were in the service of the Company, you were at the Mackenzie River, were you not?—During the three years that I was in the Company's service. I had travelled through portions of the territory before that; but I was very young at the time.

2404. Have you any knowledge of the Red River Settlement, for instance?—Yes; I was at school there as a boy, and I have a little property there, formerly belonging to my father, which came to me; I was also there one year after I left the Company's service.

2405. You have since that time, I believe, devoted a great deal of attention to the affairs of this Company?—Very great.

2406. What opinion have you been led to form with regard to the general character of the management of the Hudson's Bay Company of these territories?—Upon the whole, I think it is unfavourable to the development of the resources of the country, and also to the enlightenment and progress in civilisation of the inhabitants.

2407. To begin with the first point, namely, the development of the resources of the country, will you have the goodness to state in what way you think the system pursued by the Hudson's Bay Company operates in that respect?—It is an obstruction to the colonising spirit of those settlers who are in the territory; the Company have not made any efforts, at least such efforts as I think they might have made, to provide a market for the settlers that are in it; and they have thrown obstacles, according to the statement of the settlers at least, which is confirmed by official documents in my possession here, in the way of an export trade in tallow and hides from the wild animals in the prairies; they have also interfered in many ways with the efforts of the settlers to get up an export trade with the United States, the only outlet which is open to the Red River Settlement.

2408. Do you believe that there is any considerable portion of the territory, now administered by the Hudson's Bay Company, which would be colonised and settled within any moderate period of time, say 20 years for instance, if those obstructions were removed?—As far as we can judge, from the Canadian newspapers, there is an evident intention, on the part of the Canadians, to go up into that territory through the lice of lakes and rivers which connect Lake Superior with Lake Winnipeg. There appears to be, fortunately, a chain of rivers which are well adapted for settlement, between Lake Superior and Lake Winnipeg.

2409. Then you believe that that district of country would, if these obstructions of which you have spoken were removed, be more or less settled in the course of a certain number of years?—I believe so; more especially if the Canadians were allowed to participate in the fur trade, which I believe it is their desire to do.

2410. You say "to participate in the fur trade;" what would, in your opinion, be the effect of throwing open the fur trade indiscriminately to any

Mr. A. Lister.

5 March 1857.

one who chose to enter into it?—I have thought over that question a great deal, especially in reference to the Indians. I may at once state that my chief object, in connecting myself with this movement at all, was to improve the condition of the native and half-caste Indians in the Red River Settlement. I believe, upon the whole, that if a monopoly of the fur trade could be established, and could be possibly made to consist with the enlightenment and progress of the Indians, a monopoly would be best; but I am afraid that under the present circumstances a monopoly is impossible. I do not think that the Canadians would allow a monopoly to be established in that territory. You are quite aware that they have laid a claim to that territory, and I believe they have a legal right to it.

2411. What territory are you speaking of?—The Hudson's Bay territory.

2412. Irrespective of that claim, and adverting merely to the advantage of the Indians, what do you think would be the effect of throwing open the fur trade indiscriminately to all comers?—In some respects the Indians would be benefited; I see no objection but one: that is, that there might be a possibility of spirituous liquors being introduced into that territory in greater quantities than they now are introduced.

2413. Do you believe that they are introduced in any considerable quantity?—I have very great reason to believe so.

2414. Are you speaking of the entire territory, or only of those parts of the territory that adjoin the settled districts?—From the most correct information that I can procure, I believe that the Hudson's Bay Company have discontinued the sale of spirituous liquors in the northern portions of their territories, but that in the country south of the Saskatchewan, and down to the frontier, spirituous liquors are either given or bartered; at any rate supplied to the Indians; there are facts to prove it, which I have here.

2415. With regard to the fur trade, merely looking at it as a trade, do you believe that if the trade was indiscriminately thrown open to everybody the consequence would be the destruction of the fur-bearing animals or not?—I think not; I think that is proved by the fact that even in the western states of the United States the fur trade is still carried on to a very great extent; I believe there is now a fur merchant in London, Mr. Lampson, who is the agent for the American Fur Company and for the American fur traders; I believe his sales are quite as large as those of the Hudson's Bay Company; but the furs are inferior in value; they are of a coarser description, as all furs in southern latitudes are.

2416. Mr. *Edwards*.] Does that remark apply to all furs, or to a particular sort of furs?—The aggregate of the sales, I believe, is about the same as that of the Hudson's Bay Company.

2417. Do those sales include all sorts of furs, or are they especially confined to one or two descriptions of animals?—I believe they include all sorts of furs, as far as I have been informed.

2418. *Chairman*.] Are you at all aware of what has been taking place during the last few years in the United States; of the wars that have been going on between the white and the red man, and of the bloodshed that has so been occasioned?—Yes; I have read many accounts of these wars.

2419. They have been very dreadful, I believe?—They have.

2420. There has been absolute peace, has there not, in the Hudson's Bay territory between the white and the red man?—The numbers of Indians in the Hudson's Bay territories are so few that there could not have been any great wars. As stated by Sir George Simpson, the other day, I think the whole number of the Indians in the thickwood countries, as he called them, was only about 30,000 odd; and when that is distributed over such an immense area, it is impossible that these Indians, so distributed, could get up a war.

2421. You believe the Indian tribes in the United States to be far more numerous?—Yes, and of a far more warlike character.

2422. In fact, it is a country more fitted for the subsistence of human beings?—Decidedly so.

2423. Should you have no apprehension that, in this vast territory now subject to the Hudson's Bay Company, if there was an uncontrolled admission of whites, to trade in furs in that territory, there would not spring up wars between the white and the red man of a very atrocious character?—I do not see any probability of it, for the Hudson's Bay Company do not pretend to control

control these Indians; and they do not pretend to exercise any influence over them so far as I am aware.

2424. Do they not practically exercise a very great influence over the Indians?—They may.

2425. Do they?—I do not know that they do.

2426. You do not believe that they do?—I do not believe that they do. I have never seen any instances in which they have any practical influence of that kind which you speak of; their influence is entirely connected with trade; I do not believe that they have anything else to do with the Indians than procure furs at the cheapest rate they can, and deal with them.

2427. You do not think that they exercise their influence to keep order in the country, and to uphold justice, so far as it is possible to uphold justice through so great an extent of country, in the circumstances in which they are placed?—I believe it is a principle of the Hudson's Bay Company's administration not to interfere in the quarrels or disputes of tribes at all, or to interfere as little as possible. If any aggressions are made upon the whites by the Indians, then they punish them severely.

2428. In short, in your opinion, the interests of the red man would not suffer if the whole territory was thrown open to white men, without any restriction or control?—I think they would not, if there was a guarantee that spirituous liquors should not be introduced into the territory; if there were proper means for preventing it.

2429. Do you believe that it would be possible, if rival traders were competing with one another in the chase of these fur-bearing animals, through the instrumentality of the Indians, to prevent or restrain those parties thus competing with one another from having recourse to the supply of spirits to the Indians, which is the most attractive means of influencing them?—I believe it would be difficult, but not impossible; at least, to a very great extent. I believe the practice in the American Fur Company's territories, if I may use the term, that is, in those portions of the territories occupied by Americans, is to allow no person to trade in furs without a licence, which licence is forfeited upon the finding of any spirituous liquors in the possession of the trader; one trader is set to watch the other; they have each an interest in informing upon each other; and I believe, upon the whole, that spirituous liquors are not largely used. I have here rather a remarkable paper; a complaint by the American Government against the Hudson's Bay Company for supplying spirituous liquors in large quantities to the Indians; a complaint addressed to our Government, and printed here in the form of a Parliamentary Paper.

2430. Mr. Edward Elliot.] What is the date of it?—1850. (*The Witness* File Appendix.

2431. Chairman.] You believe, then, speaking in the interest of the red man, that it would be for his advantage that the monopoly of the Hudson's Bay Company in fur trading should be abolished, and that the country should be thrown open to the unlimited competition of any persons who might wish to engage in it?—I should not like to express a very decided opinion upon the point. I should very much like to hear the evidence of the Bishop of Rupert's Land, and the clergymen who have been in that territory, before I would express any distinct opinion upon the matter.

2432. You have considered these questions for a great many years; have you not formed a decided opinion upon a point of that description?—I have not.

2433. It is a point on which a great deal turns, is it not?—It is a very important point.

2434. You are, doubtless, conversant with the state of things which existed in that country when there was competition in the fur trade between two great companies, the North-West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company?—I have read of the disputes that took place between them.

2435. What was the state of things then?—There was a great deal of disorder and violence in the territory; I think that under present circumstances these disorders would not arise again; there was an absence of any controlling power in the country in those times; there were no clergymen nor missionaries; there was no public opinion of any sort or kind.

2436. You think that there could be an efficient system of control established

Mr. A. Toliver.

5 March 1857.

which would prevent those evils for the future?—By extending the Canadian Government over those territories, not otherwise.

2437. Do you think that the Government of Canada could undertake to keep peace and order, and to enforce a proper system of check and control over this vast territory, which would prevent these evils?—If they did not I should not recommend the territories being thrown open.

2438. Do you think that the Canadian Government could do it?—I believe it is their wish to do it; I believe they could undertake it, because that territory is now practically governed from London; why should it not be governed from Toronto much more easily?

2439. At present it is governed from London by a company who have a monopoly of the trade, and have their servants scattered all over the country?—Precisely.

2440. It would then be governed by an authority at Toronto which would have no trading interest in the matter, but would have the duty of keeping order through all this vast territory; that would be the difference, would it not?—That would be the difference.

2441. And you believe that the system would work equally well?—A force would be required in the Red River Settlement, which force would keep the whole territory under control; because access to any part of the northern districts there, is by one outlet or one opening, the Saskatchewan River, which enters into Lake Winnipeg; you cannot approach Mackenzie's River, Athabasca, or any of those territories in the north, except through that one opening. A custom-house or a little garrison established there would exercise an effectual control and supervision over everything which entered the country.

2442. What you would propose would be to join the whole of this immense territory on both sides of the Rocky Mountains to the colony of Canada?—I am afraid that it will come to that; I should hardly call it a plan, but I am afraid there will be no other way of settling the difficulty.

2443. There would be a considerable expense incurred, I presume, in maintaining order through so vast an extent of country?—There would be the expense of establishing a force at the Red River territory.

2444. There must be posts scattered all over the country, I presume?—I believe order could be maintained without stationing those posts all over the country.

2445. How could the expense be defrayed, whatever it was, of governing and administering the affairs of a country of this description?—The trade of that country is considerable; a tax could be laid upon the trade to defray the expense of controlling and conducting it.

2446. Do you think that it would not answer the purposes of Canada as a colony better, to have joined to Canada any country in its vicinity over which it is at all probable or possible that settlement should extend?—I am not prepared to speak upon that point; I only judge of the sentiments of Canada from the newspapers. Merely stating my own opinion, I should say that there might perhaps be no objection to it, and that the arrangement on the whole might be a beneficial one, taking the territory gradually as they required it.

2447. But do you think that it would be expedient or advisable to join Vancouver's Island, for instance, to the colony of Canada?—Vancouver's Island is quite a different consideration; I think there ought to be a separate colony there.

2448. With regard to the country on the mainland adjoining Vancouver's Island, which may be adapted for the purposes of settlement, would it not be more convenient that that should be made a colony, and that its inhabitants should manage their own affairs, rather than be obliged to go to Toronto for that purpose?—I think the whole of the territory west of the Rocky Mountains must be administered from Vancouver's Island, if it is thrown open. The Canadians may, however, think differently.

2449. Then you are speaking merely of Rupert's Land?—Merely of Rupert's Land; the territory to the north of Canada. I believe it is our interest to people that country, because the United States are fast peopling the territory along the frontier, and they will have that territory from us unless we do people it.

2450. You think that it would not be enough, if such an arrangement could be made, to take away from the Hudson's Bay Company any such territory as
could

could be made use of for the purposes of settlement for a long time to come; but that it would be also desirable to take from them that portion of their territory which could only be applied for the purposes of the fur trade, and to throw it open to unrestricted competition?—I am looking at the inducements which would lead emigrants into that territory; I do not think they would go from Canada to the Red River Settlement merely for the purpose of obtaining land; they could get land in abundance in Canada. If, therefore, our object is to people that territory, we must hold out an inducement to them by throwing open the fur trade to them. But even otherwise I do not think it is possible to enforce a monopoly in that territory; you cannot do it. If you throw open Red River to the Canadians, you throw open the fur trade practically. There is no means of preventing those people going there; you may just as well talk of establishing a monopoly in the gold fields of Australia.

2451. You think, whatever the difficulties are, that those difficulties must be coped with?—I think so; there is the case of the Red River Settlement; they have gone into the fur trade in spite of all the endeavours of the Hudson's Bay Company, and it is a very insignificant colony. I have now a statement of the furs which were sent out from the Red River district by way of the United States. They are forcing a channel through there.

2452. Am I rightly representing your opinions as amounting to this, that you consider the thing inevitable, that, whether we wish it or not, the fur trade will, by the progress of events, be thrown open to competition?—That is my opinion.

2453. But that you are doubtful, if it could be prevented, of the effects that such a change would produce upon the interests of the Indians, as far as they are concerned?—Yes; I wish to reserve my opinion upon that point.

2454. You referred to a paper giving an account of the fur trade going on with the Americans?—The trade going on between the Red River Territory and the United States.

2455. Mr. *Edward Elliot*.] What is that paper to which you refer?—An extract from a newspaper which has been put into my hands within the last two days. If it is received as evidence, I shall feel bound to give the date, and the name of the paper. It is evidently an authentic document as far as a newspaper statement can be so: "Here are a few interesting Minnesota items. The towns along the western bank of the Mississippi are rapidly improving in trade and population. A new land office is soon to be opened at Buchanan, near the head of Lake Superior. St. Lawrence is the name of a new town, 15 miles above Shakopee, on the Minnesota River. Trade between St. Paul and Superior is quite brisk. The total amount of peltries from the Pembina, Red River region, exported from St. Paul, Minnesota, for 1856, is as follows:—64,292 rats; 8,276 minks; 1,428 martens; 876 foxes; 3,600 coons; 1,045 fishers; 10 wolverines; 364 badgers; 2,032 wolves; 405 otter; 2,542 rit-foxes; 610 deer" (skins probably); "20 cross-fox; 8 silver fox; 50 lynx; 7,500 buffalo robes, and 586 pounds of beaver; worth, in the aggregate, about 97,000 dollars."

2456. You do not consider yourself responsible for that statement?—No, it is simply a newspaper statement.

2457. Mr. *Kinnaird*.] Is it from an English or an American paper?—It has only been sent to me within the last two days, and in that form. I have written to ask where it is extracted from, and of course, if it is received as evidence, I shall be able to state in a few days.

2458. Mr. *Gordon*.] Do you credit it, from the other sources of information which are open to you?—I do.

2459. Mr. *Graham*.] I believe you had a long correspondence with the Colonial Office relative to a petition to Her Majesty which was sent from the Red River Settlement some years ago?—Yes. I laid that petition before Lord Grey. I was myself resident at the time in England; but I am not responsible for the statements of that petition in any way. I believe them to be true; and I produced evidence in the course of those papers to support the statements made by the petitioners as far as I could.

2460. Am I to understand that you were concerned in getting up the evidence which is contained in these papers?—Yes, but not in getting up the petition; I had no connexion with the petition.

Mr. A. Edister.

5 March 1857.

2461. I refer to a variety of papers that were inclosed which were forwarded to the Colonial Office in support of that petition from Red River?—Yes.

2462. You got up this evidence to back up the statements of the petition?—Precisely.

2463. You have no question or doubt of the accuracy of these papers?—No, unless there are some misprints; there are some misprints in the course of them.

2464. In page 78 of the Parliamentary Paper entitled "Correspondence relative to Complaints of the Inhabitants of the Red River Settlement," there are the names of five retired servants of the Hudson's Bay Company, and some very strong statements are there contained?—Yes, I have seen them.

2465. Did you know any of those servants yourself?—The last two I knew personally; as to the other three, I know where they are just now, and know their friends, and know them to be respectable persons.

2466. Have you any doubt whatsoever of their being trustworthy and truthful men?—None whatever.

2467. And you place full confidence in their statements?—In the statements given here I do; they agree with my own observations and experience.

2468. Will you turn over to page 80: "Are there any schools for the instruction of the natives where you have been?" appears to have been a question sent to these five servants?—Yes.

2469. They respectively answer, "I do not know of any." "None." "There are no schools for the instruction of the natives." "None at the posts I have been at." "A school was lately established at Norway House." Does the statement there correspond with your knowledge of that Red River Settlement, and of the general management of the Hudson's Bay Company with regard to the education of the people?—It is perfectly true, I believe, to this day, as far as the Hudson's Bay Company are concerned. That is making a distinction between the schools established by the missionaries and the schools established by the Hudson's Bay Company, of which there are none that I know of, with the exception of one at the Red River Settlement, an academy established for the education of the children of the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, and under the charge of the bishop.

2470. It is under the supervision of the bishop; but who is at the expense of the school?—The Hudson's Bay Company contribute 100 *l.* a year towards the school; but it is a self-supporting school; pupils pay, I think, about 30 *l.* a-year to it; it is a school of a superior class.

2471. Mr. Charles Fitzwilliam.] Were you yourself educated there?—I was.

2472. Mr. Grogan.] And you had to bear your share of the contribution?—Yes.

2473. With the exception of the contribution of 100 *l.* a year to that school of a superior class, is there, as far as your knowledge goes, any school in the territory of the Hudson's Bay Company assisted by them?—I know of none.

2474. Mr. Edward Ellice.] Are you speaking of the period when you were there?—As far as my information extends down to the present time.

2475. Mr. Grogan.] Are you now speaking of the state of things at the time you were there?—Yes; and I believe the same state of things exists at the present day.

2476. The evidence you have just given us was, in the first instance, confined to your own knowledge; it is some time since you left the settlement?—It is some time.

2477. Have you been in close communication and correspondence with any of the settlers in that locality since that time?—Ever since, down to the present time; continuously; uninterruptedly.

2478. Do you conceive yourself in a position, by reason of that correspondence, to speak of the state of the settlement at present?—I do.

2479. You have no doubt, whatever, that you represented the opinions of the settlers in the correspondence with the Colonial Government in 1849?—No doubt whatsoever. And I may mention, that since that time, in the last three or four years, a portion of my family who were resident at Red River have come over, and are now living with me, and they of course have given me more recent information.

2480. Mr. Edward Ellice.] I think you said, that with reference to those complaints of which you were the organ, you were not responsible for the statements contained in them?—Not for the petition.

2481. Mr.

2481. *Mr. Roebuck.*] But I suppose you hold yourself responsible for every part of the evidence which you are now giving as your own opinion?—I do.

2482. *Mr. Grogan.*] I referred you to page 80 under the head of the question, "Are there any schools for the instruction of the natives where you have been?" There are five answers of these five servants, which, down to 1849, you believe to be literally correct?—Yes, I do.

2483. Are you able to say whether, at the present date, you consider that those answers would be applicable?—I believe so; with the exception which I have formerly mentioned.

2484. Namely, that there is one school to which assistance is given of 100*l.* a year?—Yes, and none other.

2485. The next question is, "Are you aware of any attempts of any kind having been made by the Company to civilise the natives and instruct them in religion?" You have the answers before you. No. 1. "They are kept in ignorance and darkness." No. 2. "No." No. 3. "None." No. 4. "Not aware of any." And No. 5. "Not aware of any." Are you equally satisfied of the correctness of these replies in 1849 as you were of the previous ones?—That is my opinion at the present time, distinguishing between the attempts made by the Missionary Societies, and partially assisted by the Hudson's Bay Company, as we heard the other day, and the attempts made by the Hudson's Bay Company themselves.

2486. You say the missionaries partially assisted by the Hudson's Bay Company. Can you define it more accurately?—I heard it stated the other day, in reply to a question of this nature, that the Company give certain sums of money, varying from 50*l.* to 150*l.*, to missionaries. I know that these are given to the missionaries individually; that no account is exacted of the expenditure of these sums; that no returns are made to the Company of the way in which education may be advanced by these sums; that they are given, in fact, to the missionaries, and not to the missions, and are, upon the whole, rather an impediment to them than otherwise.

2487. *Chairman.*] How do you mean "an impediment" to them?—In this way, that it makes them shut their eyes to many matters which occur.

2488. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] I believe those missionaries are not appointed by the Company?—No, by no means; they are paid from other sources, and these sums of money are given to them additionally. I am loth to say so, but they are, in effect, sops to the missionaries.

2489. *Chairman.*] In point of fact, do you believe that Christianity has made any progress among the Indian tribes?—I believe it has made very rapid progress in the last few years, since the bishop went out there.

2490. Is that among the tribes in the immediate vicinity of the settled country, or far back into the wilderness?—As far as the Saskatchewan. I believe that, at the missionary station, near Cumberland-house, on the Saskatchewan, the Indians have made very great progress.

2491. I believe the settlers at the Red River are, upon the whole, a very moral and well-ordered community, are they not?—I believe so; especially the English race, and their descendants.

2492. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] Your observation with regard to these sums of money being a sop to the missionaries, I presume, does not apply to the sum of money that the Company pay to the bishop?—The sum of money that is paid to the bishop by the Company is paid under an arrangement sanctioned by the Court of Chancery. The Company cannot withdraw it if they try, but the others they can withdraw.

2493. You are aware that it was a voluntary gift on the part of the Company?—Yes, I believe it was; on the understanding that Mr. Leith's bequest should be devoted to the establishment of a bishopric, the Hudson's Bay Company added a certain amount.

2494. *Mr. Kissaird.*] You say that the missionaries accept these sums from the Company as sops to close their eyes to various things?—They act as sops, that is their effect; I should be sorry to say they were accepted as such.

2495. You say that they are given as sops, which induces them to close their eyes to various matters; will you kindly state to the Committee what are the various matters to which they close their eyes?—The obstructions which the Company make to the settlement of Indians around them. My statement is,

Mr. A. Ishley.

5 March 1857.

that the Company have in various cases directly opposed and forbidden the settlement of Indians around the missionaries.

2496. Will you kindly give us an instance?—I believe a clergyman from that territory is about to be examined after me. I will give the names of gentlemen who can give instances: Mr. Corbett and Mr. Hillier.

2497. Mr. Edward Elliot. Mr. Corbett, I believe, is a gentleman attending here to give evidence?—I believe he is. I will name a gentleman from each of the societies which have missionaries in that territory; they are all in England, and can be brought up before this Committee. In addition to the names I have given, there is Mr. Barnley, of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, who has written a letter to me, which is printed in this book; this ("Fitzgerald's Examination of the Charters and Proceedings of the Hudson's Bay Company.")

2498. Mr. Kinnaird. You have mentioned one fact; will you name another?—I name three missionaries who can give distinct and specific particulars in proof of what I have just stated; two of them have mentioned to me that the Company directly and positively prohibit the settlement of Indians about them.

2499. That is one point. You spoke in the plural: "matters." Can you give any of your own knowledge?—None, except as communicated to me by these parties.

2500. Mr. Adderley. You say that you have property in the Red River Settlement?—A farm.

2501. Did you purchase it yourself?—No; it was given to my father before me, and he having been dead for several years, it came to me as his heir.

2502. When you say it was given to your father, have you any objection to state to us how it came into his possession?—I was quite a boy at the time, and I really am not aware how it came into his possession. I have never cultivated it to any great extent myself, and have never taken any great interest in it; it is perfectly valueless where it is now.

2503. I do not wish at all to pry into your private affairs, but as far as you are inclined to tell us will you state the agency by which that property is managed?—I have an uncle resident in the Red River Settlement who has the house and land in charge. It happens to be contiguous to his own property. I do not know that it is cultivated to any great extent, for land is so valueless in that territory that nobody will rent it, and there it remains.

2504. Is your uncle of your own name?—No; it is Mr. Philip Kennedy.

2505. Are there many absentee proprietors of land there?—I believe not. The fact is that the land is valueless; having no outlet for what they raise, there is nobody that will rent it.

2506. What is the nature of your interest in that land; have you the fee simple?—I do not know that there are any papers connected with it, at least I never inquired into it. It is like most of the land that is held there: held by usage, I believe. My father was an officer in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company. He got this land to retire upon, I believe.

2507. Was he in the nature of a lessee to the Company or was he owner?—Owner, so far as I am aware.

2508. And you believe that you are owner of that land, and in no way the lessee of the Company?—I believe so.

2509. Is that the usual tenure of land in that neighbourhood?—I have a land deed here which will enable the Committee to judge of the nature of these land deeds. I have a land deed fully executed which was sent to me as a specimen.

2510. Did your father purchase the land from Lord Selkirk or from the Company?—It was not purchased; I believe that there was an arrangement some time ago by which persons who wished to retire from the Hudson's Bay Company's service were entitled to a lot of land if they chose to take it.

2511. When your father came into possession of that property was it in Lord Selkirk's time or were the Company then owners of the soil?—I cannot say; I was not above 11 years of age at the time, and I cannot give any explanation of any value.

2512. Have you increased your property there?—No; not at all.

2513. Would there be any difficulty in your increasing your property, if you wished to become owner of the adjoining land, and to enlarge your estate there?—One of the clauses of this land deed is, that no holder of property shall

Vide Appendix.

shall sell it or underlet it, or assign it, without the written permission of the Hudson's Bay Company. Therefore, if I wished to increase my property, by buying the property of my neighbour, I should have to get the permission of the Hudson's Bay Company.

2514. Is the property occupied all round your property?—It is.

2515. Do you suppose that there would be any difficulty in procuring such a license to sell, if the owner wished?—I do not know that there would; I do not know that the matter has ever been brought before the Company.

2516. You know of no case in which the Company have been applied to for such a license to sell, and have stood in the way of it?—I have known of no case.

2517. Do you believe that it does impede the transfer of property?—I am not aware that it ever has impeded the transfer of property.

2518. When you talked of the obstruction to settlers, you talked rather of a negative obstruction, such as the Company having made no efforts to provide a market; are there any positive obstructions on the part of the Company, to the settlement of the possessions of the Hudson's Bay Company?—I do not know of any case in which land has been applied for in the Red River Settlement, in which it has been refused. The obstructions to settlement, that I spoke of, were obstructions to procuring a market for the produce of the settlers; negative obstructions rather than direct ones.

2519. What is considered the ordinary price of land there?—It has been stated in evidence lately, that it was 7s. 6d. I see it stated by the late Mr. Thomas Simpson, in the Parliamentary papers which have been referred to, at page 58, at 12s. 6d. Mr. Thomas Simpson was the accountant for the Red River Settlement at the time that he wrote this statement, as given in his "Life."

2520. Are there any regulations passed by the Company, with regard to the system of land sales?—None that I know of, beyond the fact that every person who holds land is required to take out a land deed of this character.

2521. Do you know, at all, the terms on which squatting has taken place near any part of the boundary of the Company's territories?—I believe parties have squatted down, and they have not been molested.

2522. Do you know of any cases of squatting upon agreement between the squatter and the Company?—I never heard of such a case.

2523. To what did you allude in the Canadians having laid claim to a legal right to a share of the trade in these territories?—They consider themselves the legitimate successors of the French in Canada, who occupied the greater portion of Hudson's Bay, before the country was ceded to Great Britain by the treaty of Utrecht; the right of the French to the greater portion of the trade of Hudson's Bay was definitively acknowledged by the treaty of Ryswick. There is an express clause in that treaty, by which the right of France to trade in Hudson's Bay is acknowledged. Some of the old maps, several of which are in the possession of the Geographical Society, show the extent of the ancient possessions of the French in Hudson's Bay.

2524. Have the Canadians laid any specific claim lately?—I understand that they have appointed a commissioner, Mr. Chief Justice Draper, to come over here to defend their claims, in the event of the legality of the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company being submitted to a legal tribunal.

2525. When you suggested the annexation of this territory to Canada, and the spread of the Canadian Government over this territory, I suppose you did not mean to suggest a forcible military occupation of this country, by forts or posts, by the Canadian Government, but an administration of the country by a local magistracy?—Precisely so; for the Canadian Government to administer the territory, in the same way that the Hudson's Bay Company, in England, administer the territory, or govern it in any way that may be considered most advantageous.

2526. You expressed a distinct opinion that Vancouver's Island and the western portion of this territory would probably be best made a separate colony at first?—Yes, that is my opinion.

2527. In regard to the larger internal district, did you mean that Canada should be free to extend itself gradually, or that it should at once be embraced within any system of government in Canada?—The portion of territory to which I alluded there was the territory east of the Rocky Mountains. I stated that I did not think it possible to prevent the Canadians from engaging in the

Mr. A. Ishister,

5 March 1857.

fur trade, and under those circumstances I think it would be better for the jurisdiction of Canada to be extended over that whole territory, in order to prevent disorders arising in that territory.

2528. But that administration might be made local, although the head quarters of the government were at a distance in Canada?—It must be local to a certain extent. I presume that the Red River Settlement, for example, would send representatives to the Canadian Parliament immediately; that there would be townships erected in cultivated districts in the same way as in Canada, and that the people living in those settlements would spread themselves northward and engage in the fur trade; and that eventually the fur trade, which is now forced through the unnatural channel of Hudson's Bay, would be brought down through the route that connects Lake Superior with Lake Winnipeg.

2529. In your opinion the distance of that country from the head quarters in Canada would not impede a very efficient local administration?—The distance is not great. I have the distances in miles between Red River and York Factory and Hudson's Bay on one side, and between Red River and Lake Superior on the second, and between Red River and St. Peter's on the third, comparing the three routes to Red River.

2530. Will you state the distances to which you allude?—Beginning from Pembina, which is precisely on the boundary line, there are 163 miles to the mouth of Red River; across Lake Winnipeg, 300 miles more; thence to York Factory, 382 miles; making a total of 845. The route to the Falls of St. Anthony, that is the route through Minnesota, is as follows: from Pembina to the Sioux River is 310 miles.

2531. Mr. Charles Fitzwilliam.] Whereabouts is the Sioux?—It is about half way between Pembina and the Crow River; thence to Crow River is 439 miles; thence to the Falls of St. Anthony, where St. Peter's is situated, I believe, is 300 more; making a total of 1,049 miles from the frontier. From Pembina to Fort Alexander, that is down the river and up and across the Lake to Winnipeg River; the Winnipeg River, is 230 miles; up the Winnipeg River to the Lake of the Woods is 175 miles; across the Lake of the Woods is 75 miles; thence to Fort Williams, on Lake Superior, is 453 miles; making a total of 933 miles. That is a circuitous route. A shorter route is by going from Red River direct to the Lake of the Woods by Rat River or Reed Grass River, which enables us to avoid obstructions in Winnipeg River. It shortens the route by 405 miles, leaving the distance between the settled part of Red River and Lake Superior 528 miles, the shortest route of any.

2532. Is there a portage from the Rat or Reed Grass River across to the Lake of the Woods?—There is an actual outlet, by the account of Major Long, who has made a topographical survey of the whole of that district; he was sent there by order of the United States Government, and has published the most minute and reliable account of that territory which we have.

2533. So that it is a continuous water communication?—Yes.

2534. Mr. Roebuck.] You just now said that you thought that that portion of the territory east of the Rocky Mountains should be aggregated to Canada and submitted to its jurisdiction?—Yes.

2535. Would not it be possible to erect that territory into a separate individual colony, bordering upon Canada, just as Minnesota borders upon another State in the United States?—There is not capital or wealth enough in that territory to develop its resources.

2536. Do you know the number of inhabitants required to make a territory in the United States?—I forget the exact number; I am not certain.

2537. It must begin at some time, and would it not be possible to erect it into a separate colony so soon as a sufficient number of inhabitants got there to create a body of persons subject to dominion?—The Red River Settlement is now capable of being formed into such a territory, as far as regards the number of the population.

2538. Why would you aggregate it to Canada?—I think it would be more advisable, because the Canadians would assist in the development of the resources of this great territory, whereas the Red River settlers have not the means of doing justice to the country in which the settlement is placed.

2539. How does it happen that the Canadians would be more able to develop the resources of the country, if the country were under the dominion of the Government of Canada, than if it were governing itself?—There would

be a greater interest on the part of the Canadians to open up a communication; for example, between Lake Superior and Lake Winnipeg. They would be directly interested in the fur trade, and they would apply capital to the opening up of a practicable route, which the Red River people have no means of effecting.

2540. Would they be more directly interested when the country was under their own dominion than when the country was governing itself?—I believe they would; they are asking for the territory.

2541. I suppose you are speaking of the interests of individuals, not of the interests of the States?—I am speaking of the interests of the Canadas as a province; I think they would be more directly interested in the Red River territory if it formed a portion of Canada, if it was called Canada North, for example, than if it was erected into a separate State, as you suggest.

2542. Then do you suppose that the people of the United States are not so much interested in the settlement of Minnesota, now that it has become a State, as they would have been if it had been aggregated to Iowa?—I do not think the parallel holds good exactly, for in one case you aggregate one State to another State, but here you aggregate an undeveloped country to a richer country than itself.

2543. Supposing Minnesota to be a territory, do you think that the people of the United States would be more interested in peopling that territory if it were united to Iowa than as a separate territory?—That is a question which it is difficult to answer. I do not think that these considerations weigh with people in settling Minnesota at all.

2544. Do you mean this, that the government under which the country is, if the country be well governed, is not a matter of consideration with private adventurers?—I think that in the United States it is generally understood that all territories are governed pretty nearly in the same way; that a good government is obtained in all the States.

2545. If there were a good government in that territory, and that good government were derived from the people themselves rather than from Canada, do you think that there would be the same interest in the people of Canada to aid and assist in the settlement of that country?—I am not competent to answer that question. I can only give my own opinion, which is what I have said before, that there would be a greater interest on the part of the Canadians in developing the resources of that country if it formed a portion of Canada than if it formed a separate province; for we all know that there is a certain jealousy between the British provinces of North America; for instance, I think Canada East would do more for Canada West than it would do for Nova Scotia, which is a separate province.

2546. Lord Stanley.] As I understand you, your great object is to obtain a convenient line of communication from the Red River to Canada?—Yes, that is the great desideratum for those territories.

2547. Red River having at present no outlet excepting the long and inconvenient one by Hudson's Bay and the one through the United States?—Yes.

2548. And you think that the resources of the Red River Settlement are not in themselves sufficient to contribute materially towards the making of such a line of communication?—I believe they are not.

2549. Therefore, if the work is to be done at all, it must be done either by the assistance of the Imperial Government or by Canada?—Precisely so.

2550. Sir John Pakington.] You stated just now that the Hudson's Bay Company obstructed the settlement of Indians near the missionaries; did you mean to make that statement generally or only with reference to the Red River Settlement?—Generally; and I referred to certain missionaries who could give more special information upon the point than I can.

2551. How do you know the fact?—It has been stated to me by themselves.

2552. Mr. Grogan.] Is it within your knowledge that the settlers at the Red River Settlement complain of the existing form of government?—They have done so; they did so when the petition was sent over here.

2553. Do they still adhere to the complaint which they made at that time?—I believe they have practically taken the government into their own hands.

2554. Is it within your knowledge that any application or complaint was ever made to the Government of America on the subject?—There was a petition addressed by the Red River settlers to the American Government, I believe.

Mr. A. Ishier,

5 March 1857.

2555. Did you ever see a copy of that petition?—I have a rough copy of it; but whether it is authentic or not I have no means of saying.

2556. You are not able to speak of your own knowledge?—No; but there is a gentleman who can do so; Mr. M'Laughlin.

2557. Mr. *Adderley*.] What is the date of the petition?—It was about 1846, at the time of the excitement connected with the Oregon boundary question.

2558. What was the general purport of the petition?—I believe that they desired the American Government to annex the Red River territory to the United States, and promised them assistance against the Hudson's Bay Company, in the event of a war; I believe that was the object of it.

2559. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Was that John M'Laughlin?—Yes.

2560. Mr. *Roebuck*.] How many years were you in the country before you left it?—I was there up to about the age of 19, with the exception of about four years that I was at school in this country; I was all that time in those territories.

2561. When you left the territory you were about 20 years of age?—Under 20.

2562. You had a full opportunity of judging of the climate?—Yes; and more especially from what I have since read of the climate, and facts which I have collected bearing upon it.

2563. Judging from your knowledge of the climate of the country, how far north do you suppose it to be a habitable country, and one in which settlement could be made?—I have myself raised corn as far north as Fort Norman, which is near the Arctic Circle, on Mackenzie's River; I have raised barley and potatoes there.

2564. When you use the word "corn," do you mean Indian corn or cereal?—Barley and oats; chiefly barley; I have also raised potatoes.

2565. Do you know the latitude of Fort Norman?—It is about latitude 64 or 65, I believe.

2566. How many miles is that north of our boundary?—I could hardly answer the question without reference to a map; it is upwards of 1,000 miles.

2567. It would be a sufficient territory to make a large state?—A very large state indeed.

2568. Mr. *Bell*.] Fort Norman is near the Great Bear Lake, is it not; the most northerly lake on the map?—It is opposite the Great Bear Lake.

2569. Mr. *Roebuck*.] Then in your opinion settlement might extend to the Great Bear Lake?—It is possible.

2570. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Is it probable?—No, I believe it is not probable; for there is such an immense extent of territory south of it that it is not necessary.

2571. Mr. *Roebuck*.] Taking half way, would wheat ripen half way up to the Great Bear Lake?—I have here the limits of the cultivation of all these cereal grains from observation. Wheat grows freely, according to the statement of Sir John Richardson, who has paid a great deal of attention to that subject, as far north as the banks of the Saskatchewan River.

2572. The North or South Saskatchewan?—There is but one branch where the wheat has been tried. The southern branch is not occupied at all by the Hudson's Bay Company. Wheat grows occasionally, but it cannot be depended upon, at Fort Liard, on one of the tributaries of the Mackenzie River. It is the most northerly situation which I know where wheat has ever been attempted. Barley grows as far north as Fort Norman. It has been tried at Fort Good Hope, and has failed. The limit of the growth of potatoes may also be said to be Fort Norman. Although they have been raised at Fort Good Hope, I believe the crop may be considered a failure. Maize, or Indian corn, is cultivated in what is called its green state, between the parallels of 49° and 51°; beyond that it is uncertain.

2573. Will it ripen there?—It ripens very well at Red River, which is about 49°, and I believe it is grown at Cumberland House.

2574. Mr. *Lowe*.] Does it bear the grain at Red River?—Yes, very large; as well as it does in the States of America. A kind of rice, called "wild rice," is grown in the territory between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Superior; in the lakes and rivers, in very large quantities indeed. It is the chief food of the Chippewa Indians.

2575. Mr.

2575. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] Have you seen the Indian grain ripen at Red River?—Repeatedly; at least the Indian corn.

2576. *Mr. Roebuck.*] Have you ever been in Vancouver's Island?—I have not.

2577. *Mr. Adderley.*] Do you know of any amelioration of climate by cultivation?—I have heard of frosts in the Red River Settlement injuring the crops; but in my time I never heard of such cases, and I presume from that that the cultivation does ameliorate the climate.

2578. *Mr. Bell.*] Do you know anything of the fisheries on Mackenzie River?—Nothing, except from what I have seen there myself. There is no account of the fisheries anywhere. A few fish are found in the river, but it is not a productive fishery.

2579. It is not valuable?—It is not valuable. I presume you allude to the fishery in the river itself?

2580. Yes, or towards the mouth?—There is a valuable whale fishery to the north of it.

2581. Have you reason to believe that the regions where there are whales would be accessible to whalers?—I believe that whalers have gone into that part round by Behring's Straits. I have not the document by me, but the President of the Geographical Society, Admiral Beechy, in his address to the Geographical Society, about two years ago, gave a statement that the United States had derived from that portion of the Arctic Sea, in the shape of oil and other materials from the whale fishery, a return of about, I think, 7,000,000 dollars. I cannot undertake to state the sum.

2582. Did you ever hear of any porpoise fishery near the mouth of Mackenzie's River?—I know that whales are abundant there, for I have seen portions of the skin of the whale in the possession of the Indians who usually visited our establishments.

2583. When you were in the Mackenzie River district, were spirits introduced among the Indians?—Not in the Mackenzie River district.

2584. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] Will you look at the mouth of the Mackenzie River. Do you see Baring Island just beyond it?—I know Baring Island.

2585. Was not that the place where Captain McClure was laid up for so many years and nearly lost?—Yes; the large Baring Island, for there are two

2586. It is in the Arctic Sea?—Yes.

2587. *Mr. Bell.*] That is considerably north of the mouth of Mackenzie River?—Yes, and to the east considerably.

2588. *Mr. Edward Ellice.*] The navigation off the mouth of Mackenzie River is not free, is it?—That bay is generally open in the summer.

2589. How do you get at it?—By Behring's Straits.

2590. Is it always accessible from Behring's Straits?—There are no means of ascertaining that; it has been got at through Behring's Straits, and also through Mackenzie's River. Franklin passed from Mackenzie's River up towards Behring's Straits, and Pullen and others came from Behring's Straits to Mackenzie's River.

2591. Do Captain Collinson's and Captain McClure's accounts lead you to suppose that there is a free navigation generally through Behring's Straits to the mouth of the Mackenzie River?—I have seen nothing to disprove the impression on my mind that that part of the Arctic Ocean is generally open and accessible, but I know that it is not accessible more to the north of that.

2592. *Mr. Bell.*] What sort of a river is Mackenzie River; is it a navigable river?—A very fine large navigable river.

2593. To what distance up from the mouth is it navigable without rapids or other obstructions?—There is one immaterial obstruction near Fort Good Hope. I know of no other, until you come to the Great Slave Lake.

2594. Do you mean that vessels of any considerable size could pass, with the exception of that obstruction at Fort Good Hope, into the Slave Lake?—Yes, without any interruption whatsoever; it is a beautiful river.

2595. *Mr. Adderley.*] For how many months in the year is it so navigable?—The ice opens at Fort Simpson, which is the first fort from the Great Slave Lake, about the beginning of May. I should say that it opens at the mouth in about a month after, and it closes about October, generally.

2596. *Mr. Bell.*] From the Slave Lake into Athabasca Lake, up the Slave River, is there much obstruction?—The Slave Lake itself is navigable, but the

Mr. A. Ishler.

5 March 1857.

Slave River, which connects the great Slave Lake with Athabasca Lake, is interrupted by frequent portages.

2597. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Do you think, practically speaking, navigation could be carried on there with steamboats?—On the Mackenzie's River, undoubtedly.

2598. Do you think they could be got there?—They must be either built on the banks of the Mackenzie's River, or they must be got by Behring's Straits.

2599. Mr. *Blackburn*.] I think you stated that the company had thrown obstacles in the way of exportation from Red River. What obstacles?—There were two gentlemen of the name of McDermot and Sinclair, (the case, I believe, has been reported in evidence before,) who desired to engage in the tallow trade from the buffaloes, of which there are immense numbers in the plains to the west of Red River. The tallow was taken down to York Factory.

2600. But you said by way of Pembina and the United States?—I do not know that I stated that in particular, but I stated general obstructions; between the United States and the Red River the obstacles were simply fiscal obstacles in the way of customs.

2601. By the United States?—Goods imported from the United States to the Red River, and goods exported from the Red River to the United States, pay, or did pay, a very heavy duty.

2602. To whom?—To the Hudson's Bay Company, at the time to which I refer.

2603. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Was not duty also paid by the Hudson's Bay Company itself upon those imports?—I am not aware whether it was so or not, but I believe it to be probable.

2604. Do you know for what purpose that duty was levied?—I believe it went to the Red River Colonial Treasury.

2605. To the settlement?—To the settlement, so far as I know.

2606. Mr. *Roebuck*.] Your statement, I think, is this: that the Hudson's Bay Company levies a duty upon exports and upon imports too; am I right in that supposition?—Upon goods going out from Red River to the United States, I am not aware that any export duty is levied. When I said exports and imports, I spoke of the obstructions which were thrown in the way of exports and imports.

2607. What obstructions are there upon exports from Red River to America?—If they are furs or buffalo robes, I believe they have been prevented from being taken at all.

2608. So that the Hudson's Bay Company prevent any exports of fur from their territories into the United States?—I believe so.

2609. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] That they claim by virtue of their monopoly?—Yes.

2610. Mr. *Roebuck*.] And by that means they prevent the people of Red River Settlement paying for anything which they might pay for by that means?—Yes.

2611. So that that is one obstruction to trade?—Yes.

2612. I suppose the great means of commerce which those people possess consists in peltries?—I know of no other article which would bear the cost of transport between Red River and any part either in Hudson's Bay or in the United States.

2613. So that the Hudson's Bay Company, preventing the export of peltries, really puts an end to all commerce in that country?—Yes.

2614. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Did you hear Mr. Kernaghan's evidence on the last day; Mr. Kernaghan stated that he complained of the trade being diverted by Pembina, instead of going to Lake Superior; and he stated that as many as 500 wagons went down to St. Paul's from the Red River and sold their goods there, and came back again with supplies to the Red River; was that a fact or not?—I believe that there is a caravan which leaves the Red River for the United States very often; what they take out with them I do not know; I think it is chiefly for the purpose of getting supplies there that they do go.

2615. But they must take out something to buy the supplies which they bring back?—Yes; it is chiefly merchants in the colony.

2616. You do not know it of your personal knowledge, not having been there so long; but have you heard that the Company throw any obstructions or obstacles in the way of these caravans going there, and that they try to prevent them?—I do not know.

2617. Mr.

2617. Mr. *Roebuck*.] You do not know if one of those wagons was loaded up to the top with furs whether it would be obstructed or not by the Company?—It would be seized; I know that there is a case of that kind on record.

2618. So that if a trader traded away his goods for furs with the United States he would not be allowed to take back those furs into his own country?—I do not think he would.

2619. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] That would be an infringement of the Company's licence?—Precisely.

2620. Mr. *Roebuck*.] Therefore the Company's licence opposes trade in that country?—To that extent it does; there are other matters which are mentioned in this land deed which appear to be obstructions.

2621. Mr. *Grogan*.] What are they?—Those holding land are not allowed to import goods into Red River from any port but the port of London, nor from any part in that port of London but from warehouses belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, nor in any other vessel or ship than the Company's ship. They are not allowed to introduce these imports into any port but one in Hudson's Bay, Port Nelson, which is named as York Factory, and there they must pay a customs duty of five per cent.

2622. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] In what page of the deed is that?—The first page.

2623. What line?—About 10 lines from the bottom.

2624. Of what date is that deed?—1844.

2625. Mr. *Adairley*.] Supposing the whole of this territory to be taken out of the hands of the Hudson's Bay Company, do you think that you could make your property at the Red River Settlement more profitable than you now do?—It would become more profitable in the course of time with the increase of population.

2626. Do you yourself consider, as the owner of property in the Red River Settlement, that the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company interfere with your making the greatest profit of your property?—I do. I think that my property would be more valuable under the administration of Canada, for example, than under the administration of the Hudson's Bay Company. It would become more profitable in the course of time. No immediate change probably would take place.

2627. Do you suppose that if the territory altogether was handed over from the Hudson's Bay Company to the Canadian Government, it would instantly alter your mode of treatment of that property?—It is not likely that I shall ever return to Red River in my life; therefore I cannot answer that question directly. But I think it would have a very immediate effect upon those living in the territory; they would have an outlet for their produce in a very short time. People from Canada would come in who would require flour and other produce, which would give a ready market for all that the settlers can raise.

2628. Do you consider that it would increase both the outlet of the trade of the country itself and the immigration of people into the country?—Yes, one would follow the other; one is intimately connected with the other.

2629. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] That is to say, if there were a good communication made with Canada?—Yes.

2630. Mr. *Adairley*.] And you think that that good communication would be more likely to be made under those circumstances?—I see no prospect of its ever being made otherwise.

2631. Mr. *Blockburn*.] I think you said that it was a very fine country and fit for settlement between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Superior?—In parts.

2632. Have you ever been through it yourself?—No; I judge from descriptions.

2633. Mr. *Love*.] Is there anything else which you wish to state to the Committee?—Only that it is very desirable, I think, on the part of this Committee, to endeavour to have that territory conveyed to Canada as speedily as possible, for the United States have their eye upon this settlement, and I believe are fomenting the discontents which are going on there. I hold in my hand extracts from a treaty between the United States Government and the Indians and half-breeds occupying the upper part of the Red River Valley, the object of which obviously is to get the Red River settlers now within our territory to their side of the border.

2634. Mr. *Adairley*.] To Minnesota?—Yes.

Mr. A. Jolister.

5 March 1857.

2635. Mr. Lowe.] Whence do you get that treaty?—It is in a book published by Mr. Ross, of the Red River Settlement; it is extracted from the *Minnesota Pioneer* of the 30th of October 1851.

2636. Mr. Grogan.] Do you refer to Mr. Alexander Ross?—Yes.

2637. Mr. Lowe.] What is the date of that treaty?—1851.

2638. Between whom is it?—Between the United States Government and the Indians and half-breeds who lay a claim to the upper part of the Red River territory. The object was to induce the Red River half-breeds to go up and lay claim to the territory; they give them 30,000 dollars in hand, and for the next 20 years annually the sum of 10,000 dollars, except 2,000 dollars of it which is reserved by the President. The object is to get them there and keep them there; therefore I think it is desirable that there should be immediate action in reference to this territory, otherwise there is a likelihood of their being drawn over to the United States to our prejudice.

2639. Mr. Grogan.] You mentioned to us that cereal crops could be grown up to a very high latitude in your knowledge; is there anything peculiar in the formation of the land, or the geological qualities of the land, that would conduce to the growth of those crops?—Wherever the limestone secondary formations occur, there agriculture can be carried on; that is to say, in all the country intervening between the great lakes and the Rocky Mountains; all to the east of that district, with the exception of a small district round Hudson's Bay, is a granitic region filled with lakes and swamps; there cultivation to any great extent is not practicable, I believe.

2640. Mr. Charles Fitzwilliam.] In Colonel Lefroy's evidence he speaks of the frozen ground, and says that the soil is never thawed; that it is permanently frozen; can you explain what he means by that?—The northern parts of both the Asiatic and American continents down to a considerable extent have the soil frozen for several feet deep. I believe that the ground ice, as it is called, commences in those parts of America which have an average annual temperature of 32 degrees; that is a little to the north of the Saskatchewan River. It goes on increasing in depth until about Fort Simpson, where there is about 17 feet of permanently frozen ground. It thaws to a considerable extent in the summer season. But that does not interfere with the growth of trees, because they spread their roots over the frozen subsoil just as they would spread their roots over this table.

2641. Mr. Kiesserd.] They do not sink into it?—They do not sink into it; but those trees which have a large tap root, such as the oak and the other deciduous trees, do not flourish in those portions of the country which have a permanently frozen soil.

2642. Mr. Charles Fitzwilliam.] To what depth does the soil thaw in the summer time?—At Fort Simpson, for example, in latitude 62°, the thaw in October extended down to 11 feet. There was an experiment made in that place; that was the whole of the summer thaw. At York Factory, which is nearly in the same latitude, I believe, on the shores of Hudson's Bay, the thaw had penetrated only three feet. At Severn, which is further south, it had penetrated about five feet. All these experiments are detailed in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal* for January 1841. A great variety of experiments were made and compared with experiments made in Siberia by Professor Bär, of St. Petersburg.

2643. In the country that you are now speaking of there are thick forests of timber; at Fort Simpson, at York Factory, and at Severn, it is a wooded country?—It is a well wooded country.

2644. In the event of the country being settled up, and the consequent disappearance of the timber, would any material change be produced on the soil in respect of thawing?—If the woods were cut down, and a freer access afforded to the sun's rays, no doubt the thaw would be greater; but I believe that there would be a permanently frozen subsoil, though at a greater depth from the surface.

2645. Would that ground ice interfere with agricultural operations?—Not at all.

2646. Of no sort?—No. If the thaw is sufficiently deep, the frozen subsoil does not appear to affect the processes of vegetation in the smallest degree. In Siberia, which is in the same latitude as the northern parts of the Hudson's Bay Company's territories, there are large crops of wheat every year.

2647. Do

2647. Do you think that the country on Mackenzie's River is at all adapted to the wants of civilised man?—The climate is very severe there; but the soil, so far as I have an opportunity of judging, is tolerably well adapted for cultivation. You can raise barley and potatoes very well indeed.

2648. Mr. *Grogan*.] Without risk?—Without any risk whatsoever. And on the river Liard, which comes from the mountains, you can raise large crops; the soil is better on that river, and wheat has been occasionally raised.

2649. Mr. *Bell*.] You mean that if there was anything to induce people to settle there, independent of agriculture, they might cultivate agriculture, but would not be likely to go there for agricultural pursuits alone?—No; the yield is not equal of course to the yield of crops in more southern countries.

2650. Mr. *Charles Fitzwilliam*.] Do you know the Saskatchewan River?—I was born upon the banks of that river.

2651. Where?—At Cumberland House.

2652. Do you know anything of the coal on it?—I have collected all the information upon that subject, in a memoir which has been published by the Geological Society; there are some specimens of the coal in this country which have been examined by Mr. Bowerbank, the greatest authority we have upon these matters, and I believe the general opinion of geologists is, that it is a tertiary coal.

2653. Mr. *Roebuck*.] A lignite?—Yes; however, nothing more than the surface coal has been examined; I have seen the coal in that portion of the coalfield running across Mackenzie's River near Great Bear Lake; there is no doubt that there is a great coalfield there all the way to the Rocky Mountains; the coal was tolerable, where I saw it.

2654. If that country is granitic, how comes it that there is tertiary coal there?—The country is not granitic; the granitic tract lies east of the great lakes, which are situated in the line of fracture between the primary and secondary formations, their basins being mostly excavated in the latter. You find the east side always granitic, and the west side always limestone, or some secondary formation.

2655. So that that portion of the territory lying west of the line which you speak of is capable of cultivation because it is upon limestone?—Yes.

The Rev. *Griffith Owen Corbett*, called in; and Examined.

2656. Mr. *Lowe*.] ARE you a Clergyman of the Church of England?—Yes.

2657. Have you been in the Hudson's Bay Company's territory?—Yes.

2658. During what period?—I left England in 1851 and arrived at Quebec, I then went to Montreal, stayed there till the navigation opened up, and thence I went to Buffalo, across the territory to Chicago; from Chicago to the Mississippi, and up the Mississippi 400 miles to St. Paul, and from St. Paul along the St. Peter's River, and thence up towards the Missouri to Pembina, and from Pembina to Red River.

2659. How long did you reside in the Hudson's Bay Company's territories?—About three years. I left in 1855. I took charge of the Grand Rapids District, St. Andrew's, as it is now called, the largest parish on the Red River.

2660. Whereabouts is that?—About 15 miles from the seat of government.

2661. What was your duty there?—I had sole charge of the parish, the Grand Rapids District.

2662. Were you a chaplain of the Company?—No.

2663. In what capacity were you there?—As a missionary of the Colonial Church and School Society.

2664. Did you receive any payment from the Company?—No.

2665. Were you under the Bishop?—Yes.

2666. Mr. *Gordon*. Did you ever visit Portage-la-Prairie?—Yes.

2667. Was not there a desire to form a missionary settlement at that place?—Yes.

2668. What led to that desire?—There were a number of settlers congregated on the Assiniboine River, about 50 or 60 miles from the seat of government, and these settlers petitioned for a missionary to be despatched to them for the instruction of themselves and their children.

Rev. G. O. Collet.

5 March 1857.

2669. Was any objection made to the formation of a station there?—Yes.

2670. Mr. *Adderley*.] What was the date of that objection?—About 1853, I think; the people may have congregated to petition for a missionary earlier than that date, but I speak in reference to my own visit.

2671. Mr. *Gordon*.] What objections were made to the formation of a settlement there, and by whom?—I was given to understand that the Hudson's Bay Company would not permit the formation of a settlement there.

2672. Lord *Stanley*.] It is merely hearsay?—No, it is positive knowledge; when I arrived in the country two stations were placed before me, and I was to choose one of the two; among other features connected with these two spots, in respect of Portage-la-Prairie, there was the prohibition of the Hudson's Bay Company, so out of deference to the authorities in the country, as well as for other reasons, I chose a station lower down on the same river.

2673. Were you informed of the prohibition by any of the authorities themselves?—Yes, it was well known throughout the settlement.

2674. But were you informed of it?—Yes, by the archdeacon and by the bishop.

2675. You were not informed of it by any officer of the Hudson's Bay Company?—I think I had intercourse with the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company on the same subject.

2676. Were you told to what limits that prohibition extended?—I believe that the prohibition would extend as far as this, that no missionary would be able to obtain his supplies for his station if he went to that spot, so that he would be starved; if he ordered his goods, for example, from London, he could not rely upon getting them.

2677. You have misunderstood the question which I intended to put to you. To what extent of country did this prohibition of settling in a particular part of the country apply?—The prohibition was directed to the formation of a missionary settlement in one particular place.

2678. Mr. *Gordon*.] What reasons were assigned for it?—I believe it was stated that the difficulties would be too great in governing the people there, and also that the people might settle lower down towards the colony of Red River instead of settling so high up on the Assiniboine River; but there was a desire on the part of the people at Portage-la-Prairie, on account of the timber, to form a settlement there. They were also driven up there, I believe, from the upper part of the settlement on account of the floods.

2679. Are we to understand that the prohibition was only to a missionary going and settling there, or to the people collecting there?—To the people collecting as well as to missionaries going.

2680. Was that opposition persevered in?—Continuously, for several years; I believe it has only recently been abolished.

2681. How has it been at last overcome?—By the continued perseverance of the missionaries, and by the perseverance of the people there, who turned out, determined at all risks to form a missionary station; and also, I believe, by the Indians having gathered around them, and expressed a desire, in common with the settlers, that a missionary should be appointed to that locality.

2682. Did you ever know of any objection being made to the formation of a missionary station or settlement in any other portion of the territory?—We considered that there were measures taken which were equivalent to a prohibition in reference to our own station.

2683. What is your own station?—It is called Headingly on the Assiniboine River, about 12 miles from the seat of Government.

2684. What measures were taken of a prohibitory nature in regard to that?—Immediately after I had begun building a little cottage (for we have to begin with a tent, then a cottage, and then a little chapel), and had settled down, and the people had manifested a disposition to gather round me, the Hudson's Bay Company raised the terms upon which the settlers could have lands. The original terms were that each settler should pay down 2*l.* before he could set his foot upon a lot of land; and at the time of which I speak the Hudson's Bay Company raised the terms up to 12*l.*; so that no settler could legally settle down upon a lot of land without going down to the agent of the Hudson's Bay Company, at the Fort, and paying 12*l.*

2685. Was this a sum in addition to the price of the land?—No; those were the terms upon which they could have it; a sort of deposit or pledge. A council

5 March 1857.

council of my own people was formed on account of this, wishing me to represent this grievance to the Hudson's Bay Company's officer. Accordingly, I sought an interview with the agent at Upper Fort Garry, Mr. Black, who very kindly received me, and talked over the matter, and promised to represent it to the authorities in London, but could not promise me any redress. I also represented it to the bishop, because it was the wish of the people that I should do so. The bishop said that the difficulties could not have been foreseen, but that he would represent it in other quarters also. Since the bishop's arrival in England I have asked his Lordship whether any change has taken place for the better; and he says that it is rather for the worse, because now the people have to pay down 15*l.* instead of 12*l.* in my own immediate district. Therefore perhaps had not this Committee been sitting, I should have felt a desire, before returning to the country, to have sought an interview with the Colonial Secretary, for the purpose of having some change introduced; because we have appealed to the authorities in the country, and have had no change whatsoever introduced in my own district.

2686. That deposit which you have spoken of, you think acts as a quasi prohibition to settlement?—Yes: the raising of the terms for the lands; and it also makes the people indignant, because many of them say, "We were the original proprietors of the soil, and now that we wish to settle down and form a settlement (and here is a missionary who has come all the way from England), the terms are raised so that we cannot pay them; we have not the means of paying them."

2687. You have mentioned two cases in which obstructions were, as you think, made by the Company to the formation of a settlement; can you give us any other instances within your own knowledge?—I can mention other instances; and I can also, with reference to this subject, give an extract from a letter which I received recently from a missionary at the Red River Settlement, who says: "Sir George Simpson expressed his displeasure at Archdeacon Cochrane's proceedings at the Portage-la-Prairie, and required that he withdraw and the place be left vacant; to which the archdeacon replied, 'I wonder Sir George Simpson does not know me better; he thought to send me from the Grand Rapids, then to put me out of the Indian settlement; and does he think I am now going to quit the portage? I am surprised that he has not learnt better by this time.'" I have the original of this letter with me, if the Chairman should like to see it.

2688. Mr. *Edward Ellice*.] Who is the writer of that letter; is it Archdeacon Cochrane?—This was written to me by a missionary upon the Red River.

2689. From whom is the letter; it is not from Archdeacon Cochrane?—No.

2690. It is from a friend of yours?—It is from a missionary in the Red River Settlement.

2691. Mr. *Roeback*.] Have you any objection to state his name?—I have not; he is the Rev. Mr. Taylor, the agent of the Propagation Society.

2692. Mr. *Gardner*.] Have you known any other case in which the missionaries either have been, or have thought they have been, desired by the Company's officers to quit the post at which they were labouring?—There was Fort Alexander, to which objections were raised in the very same manner.

2693. Where is Fort Alexander?—It is near Lake Winnipeg; concerning that I can read an extract from the same gentleman, who has written to me as follows: "Sir George Simpson has given permission now to occupy Fort Alexander; to that place I suppose Mr. G. (a missionary), will eventually be appointed; but strange to say, he was to confine himself to the fort, not to civilise and evangelise the heathen; not to form a locality or permanent dwelling for the Indians." There is, however, no missionary there, I believe, at the present time.

2694. Have you ever heard that the authorities of the Company have expressed their opinion that it would be better if the missionaries would give up their efforts there?—We have heard them state that if missionaries and missionary settlements increase, chief factors and fur trading posts must decrease.

2695. Mr. *Luce*.] Whom are you speaking of when you say "them"?—The agents of the Company.

2696. What agents, and where?—In the neighbourhood of Red River.

2697. What are their names?—I should prefer not mentioning the names.

Rev. G. O. Corbett.

5 March 1857.

2698. Will you tell us under what circumstances it was mentioned; was it an official communication, or how was it made?—There are several instances; it was mentioned on one occasion when some of the agents of the Company and some of the clergymen were gathered together discussing these things.

2699. In the course of conversation?—Yes.

2700. Lord Stanley.] It was a casual remark named by one person in a conversation?—Not a casual remark; it was a discussion as to how the system of the Hudson's Bay Company acts in the country.

2701. Mr. Lowe.] This gentleman stated it as his opinion in conversation?—Yes.

2702. Mr. Roebuck.] And was the conduct of the Company in accordance with that opinion so given?—The conduct of the Company, or the system of the Company as such, is exactly in accordance with it.

2703. Mr. Grogan.] You mention this as having been a conversation among some clergymen and gentlemen assembled; did they concur in the view which was so expressed to them; did they throw any doubt upon the statement at all?—Not the slightest.

2704. Mr. Gordon.] Were you ever informed by any missionary there that he had been desired to quit the country, and that on his request that the person so desiring him would put that desire into writing, the request had been declined?—I have heard Archdeacon Cochrane state that.

2705. Mr. Lowe.] Of himself?—Of himself; that when he was going on building the church at the Grand Rapids, which is now the chief district in the Red River Settlement, so great was the excitement occasioned by the intimidations of Sir George Simpson that for eight months no settler or native seemed to possess sufficient courage to lift an axe or hoe to proceed with the building, and that he was in the greatest possible trouble under the circumstances; that Sir George Simpson eventually went to him, and told him that he had better leave the country than build that church; that he then said, "Will you put it upon paper, and I will go to England if you will?" and that Sir George declined putting it upon paper.

2706. Archdeacon Cochrane stated this to you, I understand?—He stated this to me upon the occasion of the raising of the terms of taking the land to abstract my own district; he said, "I rarely do any good in this country without having an opposition; but we have tried in the lower part of the settlement, therefore go forward." He stated this to me to encourage me.

2707. Where?—At my own station.

2708. When?—Perhaps in 1853 or 1854.

2709. Was any one else present?—I am not sure, but still his observations were well understood in the settlement.

2710. Is the archdeacon in England?—No.

2711. Mr. Edward Ellice.] He is at Red River, is not he?—Yes.

2712. Mr. Gordon.] What is the physical character of the country?—It is very good for agricultural operations.

2713. How far from the banks of the river, in your opinion, might agricultural operations be profitably extended?—For a very great distance.

2714. More than a mile from the banks?—I have heard Mr. McDermott, who is, perhaps, the greatest merchant on the banks of the Red River, say, again and again, that he is quite surprised that the authorities in England do not extend the route *via* Lake Superior, and open up a grand overland route, and form a great nation, from Lake Superior right across the Rocky Mountains; that it could be done, and that he is surprised that towns and cities have not been raised up.

2715. Is there timber or coal in the neighbourhood or your station?—There is a great deal of coal towards the source of the Assiniboine river.

2716. How far from your station?—Two hundred or three hundred miles; which coal might be brought down the river, and which it would be very desirable to work, because timber in those parts of the country is scarce; the timber might be used for building purposes and the coal for fuel.

2717. I suppose that that 500 miles is a very interrupted navigation?—The Hudson's Bay Company bring their furs and peltries all down the same river in large bateaux.

2718. Mr. Bell.] Is that coal on the American side of the frontier or on the British side?—On the British side, I believe.

2719. Mr.