

they have been going on increasing from year to year to an alarming extent. When that treaty was negotiated in the first instance, the number of Indians who appeared for the purpose of receiving compensation was, I think, 2,776; in the next year 5,000; in the next year 6,607; and in 1879-80—the hon. gentleman has not furnished us with the figures for the past year—the number was 8,508. In that year \$44,000 were paid in annuities. Some of those parties received \$5 each. Those who received \$5 must have been previously settled with for their first payment, they must have come under the treaty before. This is evident from the number of Indians who formerly received \$12. I have taken the list of some of those who came in last year. They say: "We have never appeared here before; we want our \$12; we are going to accept the treaty and come under its arrangements." We find nearly 2,000 who appeared for the purpose of receiving pay for the first time. These parties said: "We were not paid last year because we were not present," and so they received their pay for that year. There were upwards of 2,300 names who were paid for that year and the year following. Now, I will take the year 1876-77. The number paid in that year was 2,776; the number paid in the year following, as coming under the treaty for the first time, was 1,938. Then the number who were in 1878-79, and did not appear in the year before, was 4,971, making 9,685 Indians altogether who have accepted treaty money under Treaty No. 6. I am quite satisfied there is not that number there. I am satisfied that a large number of Indians, more than 1,000, probably more than 2,000, have, under Treaty 6, been paid over twice. Then again, when you come to Treaty No. 4, you find exactly the same process going on. The hon. gentleman could ascertain this from the Public Accounts. Take the last year. We find there how many Indians appeared and said they were not present in 1877. There are a certain number who say they were not present in 1876; certain others who say they were not present in 1878, and each of these are paid for those years respectively. You turn back for those years and see how many were present, and how many appeared each year subsequently, and who were paid in former years. You find the sum total, and you find a larger number of persons who were paid \$5, but have never come under the treaty at all. Now, an Indian is not likely to fail to present his claim for \$12 and accept \$5, if he is acting in a straightforward manner. We know of many cases of that sort. The hon. gentleman has only to take the Public Accounts and go over them from year to year and see how many were paid in various years, and he will find that it was a much larger number of Indians than are to be found in that country. When you take Treaty No. 4, you find for the year 1876, there were 3,910; for the next year, over 4,000; for the next year, 5,605; for the next year, 5,878. I am perfectly satisfied that in Treaty No. 4 a large number of the Assiniboine Indians, who had received pay in Treaty No. 7, appeared and were paid again. I am sure that in paying the Indians \$5 each as an annuity, there are nearly 30 per cent., possibly more than that, who were paid twice over, if the agents themselves have not falsified the returns. It is impossible to examine the Public Accounts without coming to that conclusion, because you find that the number do not correspond with the number who have accepted the treaty and have received \$12 for the first year's acceptance. Then if the hon. gentleman will look at the provisions for the purchase of agricultural implements under those treaties, and will look at the returns, he will find that those Indians have been supplied with a far larger number of implements than they were entitled to. Of course, there were frauds practised in the first instance, and it was impossible well to tell how many Indians actually received agricultural implements and cattle under the treaty. Before I left the office over

which the hon. gentleman presides, I instructed the inspector in the Manitoba superintendency, when he visited each band, to see what they had actually been supplied with, and to report, so that the Government would know how far they had been imposed upon. I have no objection to furnish the Indians with even more than they are entitled to under treaties, if what they receive is applied to some useful or necessary purposes; but it is perfectly futile to furnish the Indians with agricultural implements if they are left to decay. Under Treaties 1 and 2, there was distributed in 1876-77, \$4,000 worth of agricultural implements; in 1877-78, \$8,000 worth; in 1878-79, \$12,950 worth; in 1879-80, \$7,680 worth; and in 1880-81, \$4,700 worth. Under Treaties 6 and 7, the hon. gentleman last year took a lump sum of \$55,967. How this is distributed we cannot tell from the Estimates, as the hon. gentleman has departed from the former practise of taking a separate vote for each treaty. With regard to provisions, I remember that when I submitted the first estimates on this subject, the hon. gentleman and the late Minister of Militia both strongly objected to the Indians being fed while they were being paid; and my statement then was that as soon as the Indians could be located on their reservations, it was hoped that this practice would no longer be necessary, but while Indians have to be collected from long distances to a particular point on the plains, it is necessary to feed them while payment is being made. My hope, however, was that this appropriation would diminish year by year as the Indians settled on their reservations. So far that hope has not been realized, and the hon. gentleman has not yet begun to adopt a policy different from the one he then so much deprecated. I find that in 1877-78, \$13,000 was voted for the purpose of purchasing provisions to feed the Indians in the Manitoba superintendency while they were being paid, and \$16,400 for the North-West superintendency; in 1878-79, the second year after the treaties were negotiated, \$16,500 was voted for the Manitoba superintendency, and \$37,000 for the North-West superintendency, making in all \$53,000. For 1879-80 the hon. gentleman expended \$56,930 for this purpose, in the two superintendencies, and last year he took a vote of \$130,686 for the same purpose—three times the amount necessary to feed the same Indians when I had the honor of administering the office. There are, no doubt, a larger number of Indians who have come within the treaties; although no new treaties have been negotiated, the number has, I think, been increased from 27,000 to 32,000, an increase not at all proportionate to the increase in the expenditure. The cost of obtaining supplies is not so great now as it was formerly, as settlements are rapidly progressing westward, and a considerable portion of the supplies can be purchased near the localities where payments are made. I cannot understand this enormous increase. With regard to the management of the Indians, the amounts expended for salaries were as follows:—In the Manitoba superintendency in 1876-77, \$18,600; in 1877-78, \$18,200; in 1878-79, \$18,300; in 1879-80, \$25,000, and in 1880-81, \$25,000; in the North-West superintendency, in 1876-77, \$19,000; in 1877-78, \$17,000; in 1878-79, \$18,500; in 1879-80, \$14,400, and in 1880-81, \$36,430. Two years ago the hon. gentleman proposed to adopt a policy of instructing the Indians in agricultural operations. I think that would have been a prudent policy, if it had been prudently and fairly carried out. But, looking at the returns, and gathering what I can from the hon. gentleman's statement, and from the reports of persons who have been in the North-West, I am of opinion that the system is not likely to be attended with success. When you furnish Indians with agricultural implements, oxen and horses, to enable them to till the soil, it appears to me that the simplest, and cheapest, and best way of undertaking to teach them would