

they got for that land was \$5 an acre—that is, about \$115,000. Where much of it went we could easily see from what I have already said. A great part of it was dissipated in that way—here to-day, to-morrow nowhere, and the Indian is left without the needed means of subsistence which he would have had if his guardian had watched over and protected him during that period. And what was done with the rest of the lands? Three thousand acres of hay land were kept, and it is there yet, maybe. And 15,000 acres were auctioned. What is the use of us spinning cobwebs over that auction? An advertisement was inserted in weekly papers some four to six times, then absolutely dropped for a month, so that it might fade out of people's memories, and then, in midwinter, on the 16th of December, the land was auctioned off. And who got it? All but 1,000 of the 15,000 acres auctioned, went to these same three or four men who had collared the 18,000 in the first lot—speculators who were onto it from the first, and were into it at the last, and were both onto it and into it because of the facilities allowed them either by the inaction or by the action of the department. For that 15,000 acres, these men paid \$5.68 per acre, which is somewhere about \$85,000. But there is another side to that. So far, \$32,000 has been taken out of that for expenses and yet only one-third of the band is transferred to the new reservation. Now, another point; what was the purpose in all this that the minister did or allowed to be done? His purpose was to separate the Indian from the white people in the vicinity of Selkirk? Are they separated? Two-thirds of the Indians are there to-day, and it is three years or more since these transactions were carried out. So, the minister has not separated them in reality. And to-day there is this sense of injustice, and this absolute injustice and wrongdoing which has been set forth by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) without any answer being forthcoming.

Now, I do not know that there is much use in talking any longer about it. We have no real jury here, and we do not even get the attendance of one-quarter of those who are to decide the case. If a vote is called upon this question, men will troop in and vote. Because they have heard the discussion and understand the case of the Indians? Not at all. The jury as constituted here, is made up in large part of men who vote without hearing the evidence or without caring what the facts are. The bell rings, they come in and vote, and they vote the way the Minister of the Interior votes. There is not much encouragement for the wards of the nation to bring their grievances before the great

tribunal, the King's parliament, when they find that scarcely a baker's dozen of the King's parliament, are present to hear the presentation of their grievances and that, by and by, when the vote is taken, the verdict will come from men who have not heard the case and have not listened to the grievances. If there is any fault for that, the large fault lies with the government. For the government is supposed to act wisely, and above all, to act legally and justly. And if there are any people with whom they are particularly bound to act in this way, they are the helpless, the weak and the inefficient, and if with any class of that kind, with the Indians who once owned everything in this country and who have been driven by the incoming white population back upon their reserves. And now their reserves are taken from them without due process of law, and they are wrongfully despoiled of that which they ought to have. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) sent Mr. MacDougall up to make an investigation so that it could be said in the House: Rev. Mr. MacDougall has gone up there and made a thorough investigation, and this is his report. Was the Rev. Mr. MacDougall sent up there in order to hear the complaints of the Indians on their own reservation and report that to the minister? If not, what was the use of sending him up at all, and for what purpose did he go? Mr. MacDougall is said to be the author of a report made on November 10 last to the minister and presented to this House. Mr. MacDougall, as I know, and as is capable of proof, met these Indians in the school house on their reserve and, for hours upon hours, listened to their complaints. I have them here taken by the reporters of the three different Winnipeg newspapers, and all practically agreeing as to what took place. In these complaints they said they had been unduly deprived of their rights. They said that the meeting had not been legal. They declared that they had been dispossessed by the law, and asked for a royal commission from the father of the Indians, from the guardian of the Indians and from parliament which ought to look to their interests.

Does Mr. MacDougall give one word of all that, in the report which he hands to the minister? Not a single word. From his report you would not know that there was any dissatisfaction amongst the Indians except that they wanted a chief and an election to get a chief. If any body doubts that let him read the report. From it you would never guess that these Indians had asked Mr. MacDougall to ask their guardians to have a royal commission to look into their grievances, to make an examination and to report the facts. Yet that was the