have persistently endeavored to mislead the public. This charge has often been publicly refuted. I quote the following from an interview with myself published by the Victoria Times on 23rd August, 1912 :---

"Undoubtedly there is great uneasiness based upon widespread dissatisfaction among the Indians of the Province, but it is distinctly incorrect that the "Friends of the Indians" have done anything in any way to create dissatisfaction. The very opposite is the fact in the highest degree. We have from the first sought to allay uneasiness by assuring the Indians that British justice would be done them. The greatest achievement in our record has been our success in keeping the Indians quiet and we have been able to do this by inducing them to act along peaceable and constitutional lines. Our object from the first has been to allay uneasiness and we have actually prevented bloodshed in some parts of the Province."

Also in proof of the fact that the real cause of all the unrest among the Indians has been the land question itself I quote the following from the Charge delivered by Bishop DuVerget at Prince Rupert in August, 1909:---

.... * * * In reviewing the Indian Work of the Diocese during the past year, while there is much to record that is encouraging, especially in the way in which some of our enlightened natives are proving themselves worthy of being ranked as useful citizens and should be enfranchised, yet it cannot be deried that there is much unrest on account of the land question, and this unrest has hindered spiritual work. It was inevitable that the inrush of settlers taking up land over which the natives have been accustomed to hunt should cause agitation, but I cannot help feeling that much of this friction might have been avoided had there been a better understanding between the Dominion and Provincial Governments in regard to the rights of the Indians, and had there been at the outset a formal treaty. While it is true that the Dominion Government has dealt liberally with the Indians, looking well after their interests, yet the natives do not understand this. They were not properly consulted when the reserves were set apart. They do not see that the money spent upon their education, etc., has any connection with the surrender of their lands. Undoubtedly the demands that many of the Indians are now making are unreasonable. but behind all the unrest there is a cause which must be dealt with according to the principle of equity if this feeling of unrest is to be finally removed. For this reason I am glad to hear that the two Governments are submitting a test case to the Privy Council, and I earnestly trust that a final and authoritative answer which will settle the conflicting claims of the three parties-the Indians, the Dominion and the Province-will soon be given. I wish to commend the way in which our missionaries have counselled our natives to be law-abiding and to patiently await the settlement of their grievances. * * * * * *

2. Another ground of the criticism brought against the friends of the cause of the Indians is to be found in the question why so much struggle should be required to get the Dominion Government to do justice to the Indians in British Columbia. I give the main answer to the important question thus raised. As result of an interview had with the Dominion Government in November, 1911, and of an interview had with the Government of British Columbia land question must be dealt with. Shortly after the last mentioned interview, the Premier of British Columbia approached Mr. Rogers, then Minister of Interior in the Dominion Cabinet, and an arrangement was made calculated to meet the exigencies of Provincial politics in that Province. In pursuance of this arrangement, Mr. McKenna, an official of the Indian Department, was appointed Special Commissioner for Canada and sent to British Columbia. He met the Indians and told them they should consider themselves a cooquered