

Robert Campbell, a chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Company, and member of the Council of Rupert's Land, at the time of the disturbances. This document was as follows:—

“Robert Campbell, a chief factor of the Hon. Hudson's Bay Company, now on leave of absence, maketh oath and saith: That he had lately seen the printed reports of a speech said to have been delivered by Mr. Schultz, M.P. for Lisgar, Manitoba, in the House of Commons at Ottawa, on 13th April 1871, in which appears the passage hereunder transcribed;—“The following description, which I found in one of the respectable journals of the Dominion, will, if its evidence may be trusted, show the feeling which prevailed amongst the Hudson's Bay Company's officials in the Northwest. They say that 300,000 pounds to be paid the Company by the Canadian Government will be pocketed by English shareholders, and that not one copper of it will ever be seen by the traders in the country. No doubt they are perfectly right in this view. When the English shareholders get hold of the money they will very likely hold on to it, but the traders of the Northwest devised a game a little while ago which, if carried out, would more than make up to them the share of the 300,000 pounds which they say the English shareholders intended robbing them of. At a meeting of the Council of Rupert's Land, the body which controls the Company's affairs in the Territory, a motion was submitted by one of the chief factors proposing that they should secrete for their special use and benefit furs to the value of 40,000 pounds, to be divided amongst the factors and those interested, just as soon as it should be clearly shown that the English shareholders intended gobbling up the whole of the Canadian purchase money. A lengthy and animated discussion took place on this exceedingly dishonest proposition, after which the motion being put was lost simply by the casting vote of the chairman.” With reference to the foregoing passage, the deponent made oath and said that he attended all the meetings of the Council of Rupert's Land held at Norway House in the summer of 1869, a few months before the outbreak at Red River, and that to the deponent's certain knowledge no such motion as it referred to in the said foregoing passage, proposing to secrete furs to the value of 40,000 pounds, or to any value whatever, was ever submitted to the said Council, or was even the subject of discussion or voting; and the deponent saith that the statement that any motion of the kind was ever made to or entertained by the said Council of Rupert's Land is entirely false and unfounded.”

(Signed) Robert Campbell

Chief Factor, Hon. Hudson's Bay Co.

“Sworn before me, for the County of Perth, at Crieff, this twenty-first day of September 1871.”

He had an affidavit to the same effect here from Wm. Joseph Christie, then in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company as a chief factor, but now occupying a higher position in the service of the Company as an inspecting chief factor. He thought he might fairly put this testimony against the assertions of even the hon. member for Lisgar. They had not been told what was the respectable newspaper in which the hon. gentleman had said in his speeches he had seen the statements he had referred to. Perhaps it

was the *Nor' Wester*, the paper which belonged to the hon. gentleman himself. With regard to the want of action on the part of the Hudson's Bay Company in the inception of the insurrection and throughout its course, the testimony of the hon. member for Lisgar was not, he thought, much better than it was on other points.

He had in his hand the sworn evidence of a gentleman who at the time of the insurrection was in immediate charge of Fort Garry and what was then called the District of Red River: that was Mr. Wm. Carrell, whose testimony went to dispute everything said by the hon. member for Lisgar with reference to the alleged inactivity of the Hudson's Bay Company. It would be improper for him (Mr. Smith) to attribute motives to the hon. gentleman, but he might be permitted to mention one or two facts which he had brought up at public meetings against that hon. gentleman.

He had mentioned at public meetings that the hon. member found him out a few months after he (Mr. Smith) had arrived in Red River Territory, and made certain propositions to him. He asked him (Mr. Smith) for 2,000 pounds and said, “Up to this point whatever, the matter shall be buried as concerns the Hudson's Bay Co. or not.” (*Loud applause.*)

Mr. SCHULTZ asked if this style of discussion was in order.

The SPEAKER said the member for Lisgar, in the course of his speech, had made a number of statements, which had been held to be in order because they might be relevant to the question of amnesty. They certainly impugned the character of the hon. member for Selkirk, and it was quite in accordance with every rule of Parliament that the hon. gentleman should have the fullest opportunity of defending himself. (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) reiterated that the hon. member had demanded 2,000 pounds from him to settle the matter and upon that depended whether there should be war, or whether the knife should be buried. (*Hear, hear.*) Some little time after that, it happened that he and the hon. gentleman were both candidates for constituencies—the hon. gentleman for Lisgar, and he (Mr. Smith) for Selkirk. The hon. gentleman one day came to him, and made a proposition with regard to his candidature to the effect that in the event of his supporting him (Mr. Schultz) in his application to be made a Senator of the Dominion (*laughter*) his (Mr. Smith's) election should not be opposed by him or his friends, or at least only nominally. The hon. gentleman had used the very best argument which had been brought forward in favour of Mr. Riel, namely, that he was only miserable catspaw, that the Hudson's Bay Company was really to blame and that if anybody were expelled it should be he (Mr. Smith). (*Laughter.*)

With regard to this little matter about the Senatorship, the hon. gentleman informed him that he had just been with a certain high personage in the Province at that time, and that he thought the best way of approaching the thing was by coming to him, and speaking it over with him. The hon. gentleman took credit to himself for the part he had played in these tremendous affairs in the Northwest, but it was hard to take from others the credit which was their due. He had told the House that instead of having the honesty and manliness