

cost of the material after the contract was submitted. That, I presume, means the time between the date when the tenders were asked for and received, and the time the contract was signed. The effect was to raise the amount of the tender by \$200. It seems a somewhat unique principle to act upon. I wonder whether, if the material had diminished in value in the meantime, the contractor would have consented to diminish his contract by that much.

Mr. OLIVER. I scarcely think the hon. gentleman can consider the latter suggestion seriously. If he wishes, I will have an inquiry made, and bring the facts to the House.

Mr. ROCHE. And bring the other tenders too.

Mr. BRADBURY. I cannot find an item in the Auditor General's Report regarding a boat used on Lake Winnipeg. I know the Indian Department have a boat there, but I do not find an account in this book.

Mr. OLIVER. When an agent is making his annuity payments he must travel by boat, and my information is that he hires a boat when he requires to make payments. We have not a boat of our own.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is not the boat I refer to. There was a fisherman's boat employed by the month. The boat was employed for three months, and after the time expired it was engaged again for two months until after the election was over. It was used for election purposes. My opponent used that boat on Lake Winnipeg for two weeks.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the use of that boat would not appear in the Auditor General's Report for this year, it would appear in the next one. The boat was employed in connection with the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve. Part of the terms of the surrender was that the Indians should be aided in removing from the old reserve at St. Peter's to the new reserve at Fisher river, and the boat was employed for some months in that work going back and forward between the two reserves.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the minister to some facts regarding the surrender of St. Peter's reserve. There is great dissatisfaction over the manner in which that surrender was conducted. There are men who take a great deal of credit for having secured the surrender of the reserve. I am led to understand that the manner in which the surrender was secured was very questionable. I know the nature of the Indian and I heard the hon. gentleman explain how hard it is to deal with him. When they called the chiefs and council together to secure their consent they refused, and there is a report current in Selkirk since the surrender

was made that the surrender of the chief and council was purchased and that these men were bought to sell the band. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction existing to-day amongst the band with the manner in which the surrender was made. I might call to the attention of the minister the manner in which the land was handled. I heard the minister say a few minutes ago that the Indian had no right to sell land. I have always understood that the Indian, being a ward of the country had no power to convey, but this surrender was unique inasmuch as it made the Indian a land owner. The department gave the Indian sixteen acres of land to dispose of as he saw fit. The consequence was that this land immediately dropped into the hands of a few speculators and about 25,000 acres of land which should have netted the department or Indian from \$10 to \$15 per acre has been purchased by a few friends of the government because none but a political friend of the agent at Selkirk dare take the chance of purchasing this land because there was no guarantee, when he had negotiated with the Indian for this 16 acres of land, that he would be able to obtain a title. He was at the mercy of the Indian agent. Consequently, the land fell into the hands of friends of the government. The Indians have disposed of the land and have received not more than \$3.50 to \$4 per acre. There is a great deal of discontent, not only among the Indians but among the people of Selkirk who feel that there was a deal in this transaction. Of course I do not suppose that the minister will believe that possible. I am not blaming the minister for it. I am trying to draw his attention to it. But, a deal of this kind did take place at Selkirk. I have a petition from the Ojibways who occupied part of the reserve asking that they be granted another reserve. They are not satisfied with the reserve which you have given them at Fisher river.

With regard to the boat that the minister spoke of, it was in commission for, I think five or six months of the year, and in addition to that another steamer was engaged for taking the Indians out. While they had the 'Fisherman,' the 'Mikado' was commissioned to take out Indians and supplies. The 'Fisherman' was in active commission by my opponent Mr. Jackson travelling up and down the lake; he was using it for canvassing purposes. I did not object to it, but I do not think that a boat paid for by the people should be used for political purposes.

With regard to the officials of the department, I understand that there was an order issued by the government that no official was supposed to take part in a political campaign. There is not a government appointee in Selkirk that was not actively engaged in the campaign from the Indian