

I myself called his attention to what I considered an outrage on our Indian wards, and I confess frankly my surprise that the hon. the superintendent general (Mr. Oliver), who is responsible for the condition of affairs which exists on St. Peter's reserve, has not seen fit to take drastic measures in order to ascertain the truth or falsity of these serious charges. I requested last session that the hon. minister should have a thorough investigation made; and before I take my seat to-day I intend to give him another opportunity of appointing a Royal Commission to investigate this whole matter.

There is another charge I made which I wish to recall to the attention of the hon. minister. I said last year that the chief and four of his councillors had received more than 100 acres of land over and above what they were entitled to. The minister replied to that charge in the following language, as will be seen by referring to page 7094 of last year's 'Hansard':

My hon. friend last night said something about a man named Raynor who had a bill against the government for \$500 which bill was not paid by the government and Mr. Raynor has not pressed for payment. I do not know anything about Mr. Raynor, who he is, or what he is, or on what ground he presented such a demand. All I know is that his bill was not paid, and, therefore, if Mr. Raynor bribed any of the Indians he bribed them at his own expense and at his own cost. My hon. friend explained that Mr. Raynor had got back the extra money that he had paid to the Indians, because the chiefs had got a certain proportion more land than they were entitled to under the terms of the surrender. That is to say that Chief William Prince got 20 acres more, and the several councillors a certain number of acres more in the neighbourhood of 20 apiece over and above what the terms of surrender called for. Chief William Prince was entitled to 212 acres by reason of his extra allowance as chief, and by reason of the number of members in his family, and he received actually 215.53, that is 3½ acres more than his allowance. Councillor Harper was entitled to 232 acres, and he got 233.16. Councillor James was entitled to 200 acres, and he got 206.88. Councillor Henry Prince was entitled to 168 acres, and he got 172.50 acres. John Prince was entitled to 136 acres and got 136 acres. The explanation is that in the laying out of the lands when the survey was made, the lots ran into one or two acres more than the allowance called for, and the block was allowed to go as it was surveyed. My hon. friend stated last night that these people received in the neighbourhood of 20 acres at least more than they were entitled to, and that this extra allowance of land was in some way, which he did not explain, used to repay Raynor the money that he said it was rumoured had been paid to the Indians.

Mr BRADBURY. The minister has given the amount of acreage. I would like him to tell the House how many of a family each man had.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. OLIVER. Chief William Prince had two of a family, Councillor Harper seven, James William five, Henry Prince three, and John Prince one. My hon. friend said last night that these men got about an average of 20 acres apiece more than they were entitled to. The figures I have given the House are the figures given to me by the officers of the department, and I am sure my hon. friend will pardon me if I say I am rather willing to accept their figures than the figures he has given, and that I ask the House to do the same.

Last year, a day or two after the hon. minister had made these statements and had practically contradicted what I said, I came across a number of returns which the hon. gentleman had himself brought down. Among them was the report of the St. Peter's Indian band, among whom Mr. Pedley distributed that \$5,000 that he promised after they had voted for the surrender, and I find that when I said these Indians had received about 100 acres of land more than they were entitled to, I was entirely too modest. The return proves that they received 174 acres more than they were entitled to; and I do not see any other purpose why that land was given these Indians than to make good the money which had been promised to them for betraying the trust reposed in them by the members of their band.

I wish to put on record the facts shown by the sworn return of J. O. Lewis, Indian agent. The minister said that Chief Prince had two of a family and got 215 acres. But the records of the band show that he had only one of a family and was entitled to only 196 acres, so that he got nineteen acres more than he was entitled to. William C. Harper, the hon. minister, stated had seven of a family, and had received 233 and two-thirds acres. William Harper, according to the sworn return of the Indian agent, had only two of a family and was entitled to only 152 acres, so that he received 81½ acres more than he was entitled to under the terms of the treaty. The minister stated that James Williams had five of a family, and had received 206 acres. James Williams, according to the sworn return, had only four of a family and was entitled to only 184 acres, so that he received 22 acres more than he was entitled to. Councillor Henry Prince, according to the minister, had three of a family and received 172 and one-half acres. According to the sworn return of the minister's agent, Henry Prince had only one of a family and was entitled to 136 acres, so that he received 36½ acres more than he was entitled to. John Prince, according to the minister, had one of a family, and received 136 acres. According to the sworn return, John Prince had no family. The fact is, he was a very old man, He received 16