

the Department of Public Works of Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware of it. Our communications were direct with this union of municipalities, and we, of course, understood that their communications were with the provincial government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I want to know definitely from the minister whether he will before all his items are passed give us the information as to what timber lands were sold and what rights to cut timber were given since the publication of the blue-book.

Mr. OLIVER. I will give the information on the next sitting day.

Grant for Agricultural society, Munceys of the Thames, \$90.

Mr. BEATTIE. That seems to be a very extravagant grant to the Munceys of the Thames to encourage them in agriculture. I think it might be increased.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a small sum given for the purpose of supplying prizes for the agricultural show which these people hold on their own account. They are self-supporting and are well advanced towards civilization, and this is merely a small contribution towards the purchase of prizes.

Mr. BEATTIE. There happen to be two societies which hold two fairs a year, and \$45 to each society would not encourage agriculture very much. Out of the large sums granted by the government I should think a larger sum than \$90 might be granted for that purpose.

General legal expenses, \$13,500.

Mr. HENDERSON. \$13,500 for the lawyers and \$90 for the farmers! I wonder what the Minister of Agriculture will say about that. During the last election he went through the province of Ontario explaining why cities should represent county municipalities, and why Conservative members representing rural districts should be deposed and somebody living in a town should be put in their places. I am afraid that he has been extending to the Department of the Minister of the Interior his policy of doing everything for the lawyer and nothing for the farmer. I wonder that the Minister of the Interior does not stand up for his own rights and the rights of his own wards and not let the Minister of Agriculture have too much to say in a matter of this kind. It seems to me an explanation is due to show why there should be such an enormous amount of legal expenses in connection with this band.

Mr. OLIVER. The reason that the grant to the Munceys is so small is that they don't need a large grant. There is, I believe, a principle laid down that to him that hath shall be given. But, in the ad-

ministration of the Indian Department, it is given to him that hath not. It is to those who need that we give, and to those who don't need we don't give. The Munceys are not in need, and therefore there is no large appropriation for them. I think nobody will suggest that the amount expended in prizes at a small exhibition should be very large.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. I want to put the lawyers right on this item. We would like a little explanation. Does it include the enforcement of the Indian Act all over the Dominion, and the prosecution of parties for trespassing upon Indian surveys, and taking charge of the Indians generally as against the white man? I find in the Auditor General's Report, on page I-9, under the very same heading 'General legal expenses' payments made to several lawyers amounting to \$1,093. I do not know whether that is intended to cover all the legal expenses for the last year—sums paid to lawyers in Ottawa, and in Ashcroft, British Columbia, and other places. A little explanation of that would let the lawyers out.

Mr. OLIVER. This vote is to pay legal expenses necessary in defence of what we believe to be the rights of the Indians in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, not in the Dominion at large. The reason the amount here appears large is because this year we have had an effort to settle a case which has been celebrated in Canada for many years, and we are in hopes of bringing it to a settlement; I refer to the Oka Indian case. Outside of that \$10,000, the expenditure in 1907-8 was \$1,093.95. That is a normal expenditure. But we estimate a cost in regard to this Oka case, of about \$10,000. When we consider that that case has been a source of irritation during so many years, I think everybody will agree that it is desirable to secure a settlement, if we can, by expending this amount.

Mr. BARR. It seems very strange that we should have this item of \$1,090 for legal expenses appearing year after year. Are the lawyers employed by the year? Are they on the list like civil servants? I understand this item has been going on for a number of years just the same. There has been one big lawsuit going on for the last twenty years. Do they do the same work year after year, or how is it that we have to pay so large an amount for lawyers' expenses? We know that the Indians are a very peaceable people. I think this is a sum, to a great extent, put down there to be divided amongst the lawyers. If we could increase the agricultural grant and decrease the legal expenses, we would be doing the right thing.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us any information with regard to the pre-