

with. It seems that this poor man had for some years lived in a log house which he had built for himself at Little Current on a piece of land, which when the survey was made came to be included in the village plot. In the spring of the year he went to the sugar bush, but leaving his wife at home. Whilst he was absent, Mr. Dupont sold the lot on which his house stood to a trader named Smylie, and a written notice requiring She-we-tah-gun's removal, was forthwith left with his wife, who took it to her husband in the woods.

Upon his immediate return, he found Smylie in the act of turning his few things out of doors, and he was thus, whilst the snow was upon the ground, left without a roof to shelter him.

Mr. Dupont's conduct in this one instance, is in my judgment conclusive against him on this charge; but in addition to it, the evidence, I think, discloses that he treats the Indians with harshness and unkindness.

to every Indian witness who gave testimony, albeit none of them were sworn. Mr. Strong, I infer from this statement alone, to be as utterly ignorant of Indian character as it is possible for a man to be. It is well known that to gratify revenge, or even almost without a motive, an Indian has little or no regard for truth. If to make a truthful statement in this particular is to militate against me, or be held further proof that I hold the Indians in contempt, it is for me most unfortunate, but it is nevertheless the truth, and I cannot say anything else. And I would appeal to the Hon. Wm. McDougall whether their frequent accusations against him that he obtained the cession of the Manitoulin Island by the influence of whiskey upon the chiefs, and by threatening the Indians by bringing up soldiers to coerce them, is proof to his mind that they are a people given to speaking the truth?

In the case of these particular men, although I do not mean to assert that all their statements are false, most of them are utterly so; and if the matter rests upon a question of veracity, I crave permission to put in testimony to prove them utterly unreliable.

Mr. Strong has strangely overpainted the case of the Indian She-we-tah-gun. And without the least foundation in the evidence laid before him for doing so, he makes the statement "that in the spring of the year he went to the sugar bush *but leaving his wife at home,*" here again displaying his total ignorance of the Indian character. The sugar making season is a perfect holiday to the Indians, and they will not be kept by anything from flocking *en masse* to the bush. The schools are emptied. The church service is deserted, and even the most aged and decrepid get out to the sugar carnival. It is a perfectly gratuitous assumption of Mr. Strong to make the case blacker against me *that this man's wife remained in the village in this log house.* Such in fact was not the case, and there is nothing whatever in She-we-tah-gun's statement to support such an assertion.

The facts of this case are simply these: The treaty made by the Hon. Mr. McDougall, in 1862, having reserved from the selection of the Indians as their permanent locations, all village and mill sites, Little Current was surveyed into town-lots and I was instructed to require the Indians of that place to select their 100 acre lots elsewhere. Twelve months or more prior to the sale of the lot