

The original cost of the outfit, say .....	\$500
One clerk, whose pay per annum is .....	500
Four <i>voyageurs</i> , who convey the clerk and his goods to their winter quarters, build their fort, guard their goods, get wood, provisions, &c., &c. at \$100 per man.....	400
The wild rice and meat purchased .....	100
Cost of outfit, besides canoes .....	\$1,500

In this trade, the Indians must have credit for ammunition, blankets, &c., or they cannot hunt, and of these, upon an average, one-third is not paid. The game may be scarce, the hunt unfavorable, so that they cannot pay; and some Indians, like some white men are dishonest, and will not pay. Now unless the trader sells at a price to pay expenses including transportation from Europe to the place of sale, the expense of agents, factors, chief officers, &c., it must be a losing concern.

In view of the facts of the case, the supposed profits of the trade were probably the object of pursuit. But before that could be obtained, some pretext must be found on which to legislate the Company out of the Indian country. The act of 1834, regulating the trade with the Indians, did not do this, but was in reality a benefit to the Company; yet the Company failed because the Indians were decreasing, the trade diminishing, and the game fast disappearing.

It was true enough, that a majority at least of the agents and clerks of the American Fur Company were, like most other business men of that time, not favorable to the political views of the then dominant party, and it is further true that the Indian agencies being now filled by the friends of the dominant party, in reward for their services in electing their chief, this would of course bring the two opposites in *political* views into contact in the Indian country, and the traders might truly enough be opposed to the then administration. But this trading Company was a private, not public concern, and the Government had no authority or right in our free country, to interfere with the business, or to seek