

whether it is true economy either to suppress the truth or shirk investigation? For some time beforehand, without pretending to go into the conflicting interests which might coalesce in that land, I sounded the alarm, that there were disturbing elements in the field, which the recent events have shown to have been well founded—in the shedding of blood, in the plunder of property, in the imprisonment of a large number of British subjects, in the barricading of the roads, in the impression created of insecurity in the dispatch of the mails, in harrowing the feelings and developing the anger of the inhabitants to the highest degree, in involving the armed uprising of the French half-breeds—which lands them on a course of anxiety and peril to themselves and others—and in throwing back civilisation for years; and, consequently, even if my papers did contain “opinions,” this opinion at least is proved to have been correct; and other opinions cannot with propriety be lightly regarded, for they come from the bishop, clergy, and the great bulk of the laity, and from some of the greatest legal men in the kingdom; and the judgments delivered by the Courts of Canada against the pretensions of the Hudson’s Bay Company, in respect to the latter, have demonstrated their soundness.

Surely, the judgments of a properly-constituted tribunal cannot be looked down upon as “without authority”? Besides, is it the right course to pronounce without investigation, when that has been solicited? Are there no grave matters calling for scrutiny? Had due investigation been carried out, might it not have been found that there are gentlemen both at home and abroad who could have given sworn information, showing that the Hudson’s Bay Company and its agents have repeatedly violated the terms of their license and the Acts of Parliament, thereby entailing penalties upon them for assuming such a