

ing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act—Wm. Sinclair.

Declared before me in the town of Selkirk, in the province of Manitoba, this 22nd of January, 1919.—C. R. Smallman, commissioner.

Well, Mr. Speaker, judging from the manner in which the hon. minister dealt with this serious indictment against his department last year, I had good ground for feeling that he did not meet the charges fairly and that he begged the question from beginning to end. Especially in his opening remarks was the minister entirely unfair, and he failed to demonstrate during his whole speech any justification for the language with which he prefaced his remarks. That is a sample of the methods employed by the hon. gentleman in answering this indictment which is laid at his door, not by me, but by his wards, the Indians. It will be remembered that I made a statement last session regarding the signing of the receipts for the patents, and this is perhaps one of the most serious phases of the whole question because probably more hinges on it than hon. gentlemen in this House can possibly conceive at present; whether the minister does or not. I submitted at that time many declarations from reliable Indians showing that they had never received or even seen their patents and that they had never, knowingly, signed any receipt for the same. This fact did not, however, trouble the Minister of the Interior who is responsible to this House for the management of that important department. He contented himself by saying that he had laid on the table receipts for most of the patents duly signed. These receipts were no doubt sent to him by the agents who had been parties to this scandalous transaction; but it never seemed to dawn on the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as the legal guardian of the Indians, that it was his duty to investigate the allegation made by dozens of his wards, and if forgery had been committed, as seems quite probable, it was his duty to punish those guilty, and to rectify the great wrong done these wards of the people.

Here I intend to submit one or two declarations simply to sustain this charge. They have already been placed on 'Hansard,' but I desire that there should be no misunderstanding as to the minister having had the facts before him when he made his speech last year. I refer to the affidavits on page 7408 of last year's 'Hansard.' The affidavits state distinctly that those who made them had never seen their patents and had never given any receipt for their patents. This matter was brought to the minister's attention from time to time before he made his speech last year.

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 29 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 252 acres, and he got 259-16. Councillor James was entitled to 296 acres, and he got 298-55. Councillor Henry Prince was entitled to 163 acres, and he got 172-56 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 those people received in the neighbourhood of 29 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.