

April 12, 1871

he did not hesitate to drag it before a body of men, and a court that he knew had no jurisdiction, and all to affect the elections, and now arrogates the right to himself to lecture others upon their honesty, and to charge them with insincerity.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman was wandering from the subject.

The SPEAKER said that he failed to see the connection between the Speaker's remarks and the item before the House.

Mr. BOWELL bowed to the Speaker's decision, but thought he was justified in repelling the insinuation of the member for Durham West and to point out that being politically dishonest himself he did not hesitate to accuse others of the same fault. He observed also that the hon. gentleman who was designated the point of order of the House was not so strict with those who sat behind him. He then went back to the resolution, and concluded by saying that some expression should be contained in the resolution excluding the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company. But as the Government had pledged their word their parties would not be paid, he would waive that point, and content himself with moving that the following provision be added to the said resolution:— "Provided that this House in voting \$40,000 to provide for compensation to sufferers by the insurrection in Rupert's Land in 1869-70, claims from loss of property, or for imprisonment, or for forced emigration from the territory, does so upon the understanding that steps shall be taken by the Government of Canada, by Address to the Queen, or otherwise, to bring to trial those persons who were in any way connected with, or accessory to the cold blooded murder, for his out-spoken loyalty to the Queen, of Thomas Scott, lately a resident of this Province, and an emigrant thence to the North West."

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) wished to explain that he would like that a full investigation should be made into all the circumstances connected with the rebellion in the North West. It was due to the people of the North West and the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company who had been so greatly maligned in connection with this affair.

Mr. SCHULTZ: I would willingly have avoided any discussion of the matter which now occupies the attention of this House. I would have avoided it, because everything connected with recent events in Manitoba has been to me of so painful a nature that now that we have better and brighter prospects, I would willingly have allowed the whole matter to have remained untouched. Still, I find in my newly undertaken duties that one's personal feelings must not always be consulted, but that the interests of the people he represents, and of the country at large must be considered first, and the observations of the hon. gentleman from Hastings North, are such as call from me, as one of the Representatives from Manitoba, all the information I possess on one, and the principal point which he has adduced, namely the complicity of the Hudson Bay Co., or rather of a portion of their officers with the unhappy Rebellion of last winter.

I am aware Mr. Speaker that the views which I shall advance in regard to the origin of Red River difficulty, and the substance of the

documents which I shall read in support of these views, may differ materially from those generally entertained in some parts of this Dominion, yet I advance them with the full belief that they are concurred in, and indeed, openly expressed by nine tenths of that portion of the people of Manitoba, unconnected with the Rebellion itself, or with the Hudson's Bay Company. It might, at first sight, Sir, appear strange that a Corporation who had lately surrendered their rights to the North West Territory, who had received what might be considered a fair compensation for that surrender, and who, moreover, still retained a very considerable landed interest in that Territory, could have any possible reason for desiring anything but the prosperity, the advancement, and the peace of the country. Indeed it was generally advanced as a reason for allowing them to retain one-twentieth of the land, that this concession would bind their interests to ours, and be the means of allaying any possible source of discontent. But, sir, to properly understand the bearing of this question, it is necessary for the hon. members of this House, to bear in mind that there are two elements in the composition of the Hudson Bay Company, namely: The Stockholders of that corporation, and its managing partners in the country. So long as the Company confined its attention to the collection of furs—so long as these elements were in accord, and the immense profits, which in former times were made, were fairly divided between the Stockholders, who had advanced the money necessary to carry on the business, and those who had in the country, the care, the danger, and the labor of the trade. Hence it was that while the Stockholder who assumed territorial, as well as trading rights, would sometimes admit, that the country *was* fitted to be something better than a preserve for fur bearing animals, *that* concession was rarely, if ever, made by one of the inland officers, whose profit was derived solely from the fur trade, and whose right to participation in any other source of profit was disputed, if it was not entirely ignored by the stockholders.

It will be readily seen, then, Mr. Speaker that there was in such a union of diverse interests, the elements of discord, and this became apparent as soon as the Stockholders consented to entertain a proposition for the purchase of their territorial rights by this country. While the stockholders could see in the large sum to be paid for rights which were then in dispute, an ample compensation for the gradual but inevitable destruction of the fur trade profits which must follow, the inland fur trading officer saw in it only his own ultimate ruin, and opposed the project with all the power he possessed, and when the bargain had been concluded, he felt that Canada had accomplished his ruin by the purchase she had made, and that the stockholders had unfairly dealt with him in refusing him a portion of the compensation they themselves had received. Men so circumstanced, sir, are usually ready for rash and even violent action, and we find the first evidence of this at the annual meeting of the officers at Norway House, held a short time after the conclusion of the negotiations, and a few months before the *émeute* at Red River.

The following description which I found in one of the respectable journals of the Dominion will, if its evidence may be trusted, show the state of feeling which prevailed:—