

interference with the fur trade?—I do not see that settlements at the Red River would interfere with it, but settlements further north, I think, would interfere with the fur trade.

3133. Therefore, you would not object to see settlement make progress at the Red River?—If the Red River were put under a sufficiently powerful government, apart from the Company, I see no reason why it should not be settled, if they could get settlers to go there; but I do not think that settlers will go, except, as I said before, to carry on the fur trade.

3134. Supposing the Red River Settlement to be a separate territory, could there be a frontier between the Red River Settlement and the country to the north of it which would be available, and could be sufficiently marked to be observed?—There is no natural boundary; the only thing is that the Indians are under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company, and they could remove them from the immediate vicinity of the settlers.

3135. Are you aware whether the fur trade which has been carried on by citizens of the United States within the borders of the Hudson's Bay Company's territory has been very profitable to the individuals?—I cannot speak as to that; my information is very imperfect upon that subject; I have no personal knowledge of it; the United States Fur Company have posts in the immediate vicinity of the Hudson's Bay posts, and they will give a high price for the furs of course, and use every means to get the Indians to bring the furs to them, but how far it is profitable I cannot say.

3136. Do you see any objection to giving every facility in order to promote communication between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement, to promote roads and other means of intercourse?—I see no objection to improving the communications at all; naturally if the Government were to make a road there they would wish it removed from the United States frontier.

3137. Could there be a good communication from Lake Superior without at all touching upon the United States territory?—I think it would be difficult to find a good route; the country is very hilly and rocky.

3138. The country in that part near Lake Superior is very difficult and rocky?—It is very difficult. The watershed is close to Lake Superior, and the ascent very sudden; within a distance of 50 miles, the ascent is from 600 to 900 feet.

3139. Supposing the communication were through the American territory, would there be much difficulty in paying tolls or rates of duty for the transit?—I cannot answer that question. The easiest communication to Red River is through the American territory by way of St. Paul's, I believe. That is the easiest ascent, but it is by no means a safe route, I am told. Travellers are subject to the hostile incursions of Indians.

3140. Would not it be possible to make some arrangement between the Government of this country, the Government of the United States, and the Hudson's Bay Company, which might be advantageous to all three?—I dare say that that might be done. There is an arrangement for the transit of goods from Canada through the United States by way of New York. The goods are carried free of duty for embarkation there, and merely pay for the transit. They are sealed up.

3141. British manufactures are now carried in that way sometimes from New York, are they not?—They are carried to New York by the Genessee from Canada, and in the same way the American ships descend the St. Lawrence; ships that have come from the American coasts of the Great Lakes.

3142. Mr. Bell.] Do you think that any scheme which might be proposed for cultivating the country, and taking advantage of its natural products, would be incompatible with the fur trade; that it would collect settlers and make it impossible to keep the fur trade closed?—I think that if settlers were to come in in sufficient numbers the fur trade would suffer.

3143. And that would lead to disturbance throughout the country, and it would be impossible to preserve tranquillity?—Without a strong Government.

3144. Lord Stanley.] In the event of a considerable influx of settlers taking place at the Red River, would it be necessary to remove the Indians from the Red River, or do you consider that a European settlement could co-exist with the Indian population?—I do not think, as far as I understand it, that it would be necessary to remove any Indians from the Red River; but (I am only speaking now from supposition) I think that the Company would remove the Indians