

acres more than he was entitled to. So, according to the minister's statement, these men got 962 acres of land amongst them, though they were entitled, under the terms of the treaty, to only 788 acres, so that they received, as I have stated, 174 acres more than they were entitled to. They had already got nearly twelve times as much land as the ordinary Indian for agreeing to this surrender, and in addition to that they are given 174 acres, without authority. I do not know where the minister or his officials got the authority to give this extra 174 acres. Speaking on this question last year, the minister drew my attention to the fact that these men could not receive one acre of land without the vote of the band. I believe he was right. The band never voted to give these men 174 acres. Last session the minister made the emphatic statement that I was in error in this charge, and that he would take, and would ask the House to take, the statement of his officials in preference to the statement I made. In view of this fact, and of the statement I laid before the House, which, I presume, he has verified—I placed it on 'Hansard' on a question of privilege—he owes it to himself, and he certainly owes it to me, to make some explanation of how these Indians got these lands. When he speaks, I hope he will inform the House who gave authority to his agents to give these Indians 174 acres more than they were entitled to under the terms of the treaty.

Now, I have given these as fair specimens of how the minister has justified his virulent remarks regarding my speech last session. I may be pardoned, if I say that after three and a half hours of evading the charges made by me he has left unanswered the most serious indictment ever preferred against the Indian Department of this country, and that his speech—I do not mean to be offensive—was replete with misleading and inaccurate statements that are very difficult to reconcile with a desire on his part to be fair or frank in this matter. 'Inexactitude' would be a mild word for me to use if I were to attempt to characterize the speech the hon. gentleman made in reply to my speech of last session. The minister has not adduced any evidence in rebuttal of the charges of maladministration made against his department by the Indians—the men who have suffered through this transaction—many of which charges I laid before the House last year and supported with sworn declarations. I feel that the minister has begged this question almost in every case; and he still has the temerity to stand in his place and ask the House to believe that there is nothing in the statements that I have made, nothing in the sworn indictment laid at his door by his own wards, the Indians. The state-

ments of the minister are not elevating, and not encouraging to the country; nor do they justify his opening, well-prepared criticism which, I am sure, the hon. gentleman himself could not expect to be taken seriously either by myself or by the country. It was the old trick, a little play to the galleries in the hope of drawing the attention of the House and the country away from the serious indictment he was endeavouring, as best he could, to evade or distract. After plenty of time to investigate and consider my remarks of last session, I wish to emphasize the absolute correctness of these charges made against the Indian Department. Every charge then made regarding the treatment of the St. Peter's Indians was supported by sworn statements which have since been verified by reliable men who were on the ground and knew the facts. But, instead of meeting these serious charges fairly and frankly, the minister responsible to this House for this outrage contents himself with hurling at my head his opening criticism, and then evades as many of the charges as possible, and denies the correctness of others, but in no case adducing any evidence to substantiate his denial, or in rebuttal of the sworn declarations of his wards which he asks the House to disbelieve. Surely, the House has a right to expect the minister appointed by this government as Superintendent General, the guardian of the Indians, to rather take the side of the Indians in a matter of this kind than to take the side of the men of whom the Indians complain and whom they blame for the transaction I have tried to lay before the House. The Indians state distinctly, in language more forcible than I am permitted to use in this House, that they have been practically buncoed out of a reserve worth a million and a half dollars. I do not think it is any exaggeration to state that that reserve is worth every cent of a million and a half of money, and the Indians have not one dollar to-day to show for it. I do not know what is to their credit, but I have not the slightest doubt that it is a very small amount. The Department of Indian Affairs is wholly responsible, and must accept the responsibility, for having allowed these Indians to be practically cheated out of that valuable reserve.

Now, I felt that I could not, in justice to myself, allow the hon. gentleman's speech of last session to go uncorrected. I felt that I owed it to myself, to my friends and to the country, to point out as clearly as I could, that the hon. gentleman had failed entirely to answer the serious indictment laid at his door by the Indians through me in this House last session. Therefore, I have taken up this much of the time of the House for that purpose.

I intend now to refer to another phase of this question which I believe is the most