

famous township of St. Louis de Langevin, and reflecting upon my conduct in connection with the recent investigation made by me, under instructions from you, having for object the settlement of the land claims of those settlers.

"The statements of this correspondent are entirely untrue, and as the subject is one which affects my personal honor, I desire briefly to refer to them. It is stated:

"1. That for four years William Bremner could not obtain entry. The best reply to this will be found in the third clause of Bremner's affidavit, in which he states:

"3. That at the time of survey we had not made up our minds how we would take up the land. I came up here on account of my family. They desired the land to be taken up as river lots, and we decided to try and obtain it that way. My son Alexander concluded he would be too much cramped, so gave his claim to William Bremner, and moved to section 5. We never applied for entry at Dominion Lands Office, Prince Albert, waiting to see whether entry would be granted in other river frontages or not.

"I represented myself to Mr. Bremner as having been sent to make investigations into the claims of settlers, with a view to instructions being given to the agent to grant entries, which instructions were given by me on leaving Prince Albert, 7th December, 1885. As to his knowledge about the Prince Albert Colonisation Company and its alleged influence in depriving people of their lands, Mr. Bremner, in that paragraph of his affidavit, states:

"4. That I never was told nor do I believe my son or son-in-law were, or I should have heard of it, that we could not obtain entry for the land as we desired it. Riel once told me possibly we would not obtain it. Had we believed, we would then have abandoned not continuing to make further improvements as we have done."

"The best comment on the story of their fear that their interest would not be protected in consequence of the allotment to the company is this affidavit of Mr. Bremner, from which it will be seen that so far as his family were concerned they continued making improvements during the whole period of the Riel agitation and subsequent to the outbreak. The same observations apply equally to all the settlers in this township.

"That either Mr. Bremner or his son Joseph subscribed to an affidavit through fear is untrue; in no case were either threats or promises used. That they were asked to sign what is not correct is equally untrue. Indeed, the care with which every statement was explained to them, and their carefulness in subscribing to nothing which they did not know to be true, is shown by the closing part of Joseph Bremner's affidavit, as follows:—

"And declare that the statements contained in the declaration of William Bremner, corroborated by the said Moïse and Alexander Bremner, are true and correct in every particular, except regarding the statement of William Bremner as to the date Alexander commenced residence on his claim, it being stated by Alexander, in April, 1884, not autumn, 1884, as stated by William Bremner."

"It is said that Moïse Bremner, who witnessed the signature to Pearce's affidavit, declared that Pearce caused only a part of the document to be read. In reply to this, I have to say that Moïse Bremner witnessed no signatures to affidavits, nor was he ever present when affidavits were taken from parties other than himself, except possibly that of his father. The practice I have always adopted in taking affidavits which, in the performance of my duties for many years, I have been constantly called on to do, is, when parties cannot read, after the affidavit has been prepared on their statement, to read it over carefully to them, and to certify the same in the jurat. Where the party did not understand English, I had it translated, and explained to them in French or Indian, as the case might be. The name of the person so translating it and the fact of such translation being certified to. This, as you will see by reference to the affidavits, was done in the cases in question. The correspondent of the *Globe* states that Norman McKenzie, Jean Baptiste Boucher, Moïse Bremner, George A. McLeod, Peter Carson, Charles Nolin and Thomas Slater, were not asked to sign affidavits, as they could read English. The best answer to this is that Norman McKenzie, Jean Baptiste Boucher and Moïse Bremner, did make affidavits, and these affidavits appear in the report of your speech as printed in the *Hansard*.

"The affidavits of Messrs. McLeod and Carson. It is true, were not obtained for the sufficient reason that McLeod had made his entry on 28th November, 1883, and Carson on the 12th August, 1885. I had only to investigate the case of those who had not obtained entry.

"As to Charles Nolin, his claim was in a township which had never formed a portion of any colonisation company's tracts, and as I was enquiring into the position of those on the land allotted to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, there was no occasion to obtain an affidavit from him. Thos. Slater is not in the Prince Albert District, his claim being the one now held by Norman McKenzie, who purchased it from him in the autumn of 1883.

"If John Toogood was the only party who obtained entry in October, 1883, it was because he was the only one who applied. All others who were there at that date, or who desired entry, could have obtained the same.

"As to the statement that entries were refused in November, 1883, because the lands had passed into the hands of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, it is sufficient to say that McLeod obtained entry within the tract as late as 28th November, 1883.

"The statement that a large number of settlers left the tract because they could not obtain entries is not borne out by the facts that some who inspected the land with a view to settling, afterwards settled elsewhere, is no doubt true, but that occurs all over the North-West.

"It is true that as far back as 1882, some settlers who had apparently intended to settle on the South Saskatchewan, or what is now known as Mr. WURTE (Cardwell).

St. Louis de Langevin, were persuaded by one Peter Taylor to move to what is now known as the Bresselar Settlement, above Battleford; but it will hardly be contended that their moving was in any way the result of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company. It is not true, as stated, that Mr. Duck and I kept these affidavits secret from Charles Nolin, McLeod and a few others of the most intelligent settlers. There was no reason why they should be shown to either Nolin or McLeod. If the settlers had expressed a wish that they should have been shown to them, they would have been shown—in fact, if Nolin or McLeod had asked to see them, even without being requested to do so by the parties interested, I would gladly have shown them. The correspondent then gives a list of persons who, he says, were in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin when the bonds were sold to the Prince Albert Colonisation Society, and suggests that these persons were deprived of their lands by the Government in favor of the Prince Albert Colonisation Society. In reply, I have to say that the first five named in this list were not in the colonisation company's tract at all. They are as follows: Widow Margaret Ouellette, Charles Nolin, Maxime Lepine, Norbert Finchelt and Michael Canny. The last named, it may be stated, made entry and received his patent long since. As to the others, the following are the facts as to their settlement: Alexander Bremner, commenced residence April, 1884; Alcide Legaré, not yet commenced residence, no buildings, and four acres breaking; George Fiddler, commenced residence August, 1885; Marguerite Boyer (widow), commenced residence June, 1883; Baptiste Boyer, not yet commenced residence, 15 acres breaking, and has improvements to value of \$225; W. Bruce, commenced residence June, 1884; Fred Fiddler, no residence or improvements; Antoine Richard, commenced residence August, 1883; Elzéar Swain, commenced residence July, 1884; Jonas Laviolette, not yet commenced residence; Joseph Bremner, commenced residence September, 1885; Moïse Bremner, commenced residence September, 1884; Jean Baptiste Boucher, jun., commenced residence November, 1882; Jean Baptiste Boucher, sen., commenced residence August, 1882 (the names Baptiste Boucher and Baptiste Boucher, sen., represent one and the same party, the correct name being Jean Baptiste Boucher, sen.); Marie Lavallée has not yet commenced residence (her improvements are worth \$80), has been living in Prince Albert for past two years; Solomon Boucher, not commenced residence, has improvements worth \$70; Charles Eugène Boucher, not commenced residence, improvements worth \$50; Alexander McDougall, commenced residence October, 1884; Norman McKenzie only made his entry in March, 1886. And none of these people were in any way disturbed in their settlement in consequence of the grant to the colonisation company.

"Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) "WM. PEARCE."

That is the statement of Mr. Pearce as to the condition in which he found these people when he made this examination, and in answer to the charge made against him in the *Globe*; but of those affidavits, many, as you will remember, were testified to by Mr. George Duck who is agent for many years in Prince Albert—a gentleman who, I believe, was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, who is an exceedingly good officer, who understands the French and Cree languages, and who has therefore had a good deal of intercourse with the people of that district. And Mr. Duck makes the following declaration:—

"I, Joseph Duck, formerly local agent of Dominion lands for Prince Albert district, and now employed in the office of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, Winnipeg, do solemnly declare:

"That I was appointed local agent of Dominion lands in March, 1878, and have been constantly resident in Prince Albert district, from the month of September of that year until January, 1885. That I have read the report of Mr. Superintendent Pearce on the Saskatchewan land claims, addressed to the Minister of the Interior, dated at Prince Albert, N.W.T., 14th December, 1885. That, together with Louis Marion, I accompanied Mr. Pearce on his visit to the settlers named in the list numbered 3, included in said report. That I was personally present at the interviews held by Mr. Pearce with the persons named in the said list. That I know personally the greater part of the persons so named. That, in each and every case in which the persons interrogated were not familiar with the English language, the conversation between Mr. Pearce and the said persons was conducted through the assistance of the said Louis Marion, who acted as interpreter, and who, I know, translated carefully into French or Indian the questions put by Mr. Pearce, and also faithfully translated into English the answers made by the persons interrogated. That the said Louis Marion is a French half-breed, thoroughly familiar with the English and French languages, and also the several Indian languages spoken in the Saskatchewan. That the statements made by Mr. Pearce, as to the result of his investigation herein alluded to, and contained in the report referred to, represent the facts faithfully as they were elicited by him, and truthfully and fully represent the substance of the information obtained by him, which, as above set forth, he had with the persons named in the list No. 3, which forms part of the appendix to the said report. That the chief object of the visit of Mr. Pearce was to complete the investigation commenced by me into the claims of persons resident in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, which I could not complete owing to the absence, at the time of my enquiry, of many of the settlers having claims to lands in the said parish. That, in each case, and of every person interrogated, he asked the question whether such person had ever been refused entry in accordance with