

his freedom from all interest, and certainly from all bias in favor of the claimants, is entitled to be heard with perfect confidence; and he says the true value of the land on the town site alone of Vancouver in 1866 was \$773,070. I commend the evidence of this witness to the consideration of the Commissioners; as to the rest of the evidence, I am content with requesting only that it may be, as it undoubtedly will be, carefully analysed and weighed.

CONCLUSION AS TO THE POSTS (p. 57 to 64).

This conclusion seems to me to divide itself into two branches—I can scarcely call them propositions. The first presents a labored comparison of the Indian possession of the country with that of the Hudson's Bay Company. The Counsel for the defence comes to the conclusion that they were alike, because the Indian possession is lost with the extinction of the tribe, and the possession of the Hudson's Bay Company, as he asserts, is lost with the expiration or revocation of the License of Exclusive Trade; and after having built up this card house to his own satisfaction, he nails the whole with this salient and convincing piece of logic: "That this right of occupancy must be limited in point of duration by the legal continuance of the License of Trade is clear, *because, unless so limited, there is no limitation to it and it would be perpetual.*" This is an argument *ex necessitate* with a vengeance—Because the possession would be perpetual unless it be limited by the License, therefore the License *must, says he, be made to limit it*, whether by its terms or by the facts which interpret them it does so or not. It has been shown, not once but repeatedly that the legal continuance of the License of Trade had no connection with the possessory rights of the Company guaranteed by the Treaty either in originating or continuing them, but that these rights existed entirely independently of the License, and were by that Treaty made perpetual. What particular application or virtue the Indian possession has had in evolving the great truth announced in this pregnant sentence, I do not fully comprehend, but it is enough that it has given an opportunity for again introducing the unfounded assumption of the Respondents with respect to the License of Trade.

2. The second branch of the "Conclusion" contains an exposition