

and just, and the matter was allowed to drop. He must also remind the House of the violence, lawlessness, and bloodshed which were proved before Parliament in 1819 to have taken place in the case of the Red River Settlement. These facts were proved in official documents laid before Parliament, on which occasion Mr. Edward Ellice, though stating himself to be a large shareholder in the company, gave evidence to their unfitness to undertake colonisation. His words were remarkable, and were applicable and conclusive at the present time :—

“ Though Lord Selkirk’s primary and principal object was colonisation, yet he must be pardoned for saying that it had afterwards become connected with purposes of trade. The noble Lord was a considerable proprietor in the Hudson’s Bay Company ; and he could not help thinking that if his Lordship’s only object was colonisation, he should not have embarked in trade. He (Mr. Ellice) was a considerable proprietor in the Hudson’s Bay Company ; and when the plan of colonisation was first proposed, he, at a meeting of the shareholders, entered his protest against it. The opinion of the late Attorney General, now Chief Baron of Scotland, was, that the Crown had no right to grant the land to the Hudson’s Bay Company.”

At that time an opinion was given by lawyers of the very highest eminence, who agreed in questioning the validity of the charter. That opinion was signed by Sir Arthur Pigot, Mr. Brougham, and Mr. Spankie, and it contains the following passage :—

“ By the temporary Act of 2nd William and Mary, for confirming to the Governor and Company their privilege and trade, the duration of that confirmation is expressly limited to seven years, and to the end of the next Session of Parliament, and no longer. Part of the preamble to the Act is, in fact, a legislative declaration of