

English and Scotch, as distinguished from Orkney-men, *i.e.*, if any reliance can be placed on names.

Our writer, page 384, says that Lord Selkirk "held up the opposition to the "world as profiting upon (*sic*) the weakness of the Indians by giving them "alcohol, yet he ordered distilleries set "up (*sic*) in his colony afterwards, saying, 'We grant the trade is iniquitous, "but if we don't carry it on others will ; "so we may as well put the guineas in "our own pockets.'"

This is a very grave charge to make against such a nobleman, one whose name is justly revered in this country, and before he can be reduced to the degrading position of a rum-seiler to the Indians, Mr. Ralph will have to produce his authority. On the very face of his words it looks as though he had confused the settlers with the Indians. There is a wide difference between allowing the colonists to make liquors for their own use and "ordering" distilleries to be set up for the purpose of nefarious traffic with the natives. Even the Earl's grants of lands to the colonists contained clauses restraining the sale of spirits to the Indians. The statement that, on hearing of the troubles at Red River, "Lord Selkirk came with all speed, reaching Canada in 1817" is, as might be expected, inaccurate. He had been there, with his family, since the autumn of 1815. Mr. Ralph is, however, correct in stating that Canada "was now (1817) an *English colony*," but this piece of information, while it shows careful attention to details, yet is not calculated to make anyone unnecessarily enthusiastic over the writer's knowledge of Canadian history as unfortunately he apparently has never heard of the Treaty of Paris.

It sounds well, doubtless, to refer to the "bumptious governors" of the Hudson's Bay Company and the "little putty-pipe cannon" of their forts, but then facts are stubborn things, and here, for instance, is the description of Fort Prince of Wales, from a resident at the time it was taken by La Perouse in August, 1782, which explodes the "putty-pipe" pleasantry: "The Fort at this time "mounted forty-two cannon, six, twelve, "and twenty-four pounders, was provided

"with ammunition in great plenty and "the Factory was not in immediate want "of provisions of any kind . . . It "was built of the strongest materials, its "walls were of great thickness, and very "durable, it having been forty years in "building, and attended with great expense to the company."

And here is York Fort in the same year: "The defence of York Fort consisted of thirteen cannon, twelve and "nine pounders, which formed a half "moon battery in the front of the Factory . . . On the ramparts were "twelve swivel guns mounted on carriages . . . Every kind of small "arms were in plenty and good condition "within the Fort."

Not bad fortresses, one would think, for the desolate shores of Hudson's Bay, and provided these works were manned by stout hearts—which they were not—well able to give a good account of any enemy who ventured into that inland sea.

The allegation that Governor Miles McDonnell (formerly a captain in the Royal Canadian Volunteers) admitted that he had no warrant to style himself "captain" and "governor" is also contrary to fact. In the celebrated proclamation of Jan. 8, 1814, he was careful to recite that he had "been duly appointed Governor of Assiniboia," and signed his name as such, and he later asserted his gubernatorial status at the trials at Montreal, and on oath stated that "I had a commission as governor from the Hudson's Bay Company under the authority of their charter," and, "I had a commission appointing me Governor of the District of Ossiniboia, and it was in virtue of that commission that I acted in the Red River country."

The overplus trade of the Company, which appears to be something strange and underhand to Mr. Ralph, was a well recognized institution. It would be easy to quote authorities in support of the statement but one from a rival in trade will be sufficient. Long, the well-known Canadian trader states in his "Voyages and Travels," 1791, page 128: "It cannot be supposed that they (the company) "are ignorant of this 'over plus trade,' or "the means by which their servants obtain the advantages arising from it;