

*By Hon. Mr. McLennan:*

Q. In other words, would your view be that a larger proportion should be spent on agricultural education?—A. I do not just say that; I do not say lessen one to increase the other.

Q. But if it is shown that what is being done for education is not being properly done, we should know it, and I think your view is that these amounts, which are quite small—\$6,000 or \$8,000 per year—should be increased.—A. To \$60,000 or \$80,000.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: But these amounts, this \$6,000 or \$8,000, are separate from education.

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: That seems to me to be a very small amount.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: A very small proportion of that \$8,000 would be spent on agricultural education; that is more as aids to agriculture.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Yes; it says "Aids to agriculture, cleansing orchards, etc., spraying."

Hon. Mr. STEWART: As I understand Mr. Kelly, his idea is that when the public school course, which is practically the same as that given to the children in all the schools, is completed, something might be done supplementarily in the way of agricultural education.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: That might be worth considering.

The WITNESS: Not only agriculture, but vocational training for Indians. That is what we have been demanding.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I think that is very valuable evidence myself.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: The best we have had.

The WITNESS: Because necessity is forcing the Indians to demand that more and more. While the sums expended on education seem large ones, yet they are not too large at all—

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: We are not suggesting that. I want you to get that out of your mind. If we can increase it, if it is desirable, or properly directed, or if we can direct it in a different way—

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: It was said by the old chief there were quite a number of invalids of the war, and as I understood him, they were not getting the consideration he thought they should be getting.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: I thought he referred rather to some members of his own family.

The WITNESS: Some members of his own band. I am not prepared to speak of that in any definite way—

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: Have you noticed any such cases?

The WITNESS: I know there are some cases, but in nearly every case, the returned Indian soldier has been treated the same as any other returned soldier.

*By Hon. Mr. Murphy:*

Q. That is your opinion on that point?—A. Yes; there is no difference at all; the returned Indian soldier has been treated just as considerately as any other returned soldier. So we have put in the things that we consider to be the necessary basis of settlement. Now that is on record. Before we are entitled to that, we must show that we are entitled to it, and we claim that our aboriginal title gives us the right to claim that, because it has been advanced that we received these things as a matter of grace, not because we were entitled to them, but just because it is the goodwill of the Government and nothing else.

*By Mr. McPherson:*

Q. And you are putting forward a different proposition?—A. Yes.