sum, were so useless that they had to be disposed of within the year. The whole thing is an outrage Parliament should not tolerate. The Government should be held to a strict account, and I propose to hold them to a strict account, for this wasteful expenditure of public money. I find further that the Indian account is charged with payments to Mr. Baker of $\$ 45$ each for three waggons, although I find that the Government could and did buy from other contractors better waggons at $\$ 57.50$ each. In other words, the people had to pay, $\$ 37.50$ more for each waggon than they were worth. There are still some items to which I would draw, Mr. Speaker, your particular attention. The Indian account was charged a joar or two ago with still more curious items. Among them are a table cloth and a napkin for His Grace the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the North-West, $\$ 6.70$; for washing his blanketo, $\$ 6.50 ; 150$ yards of cotton, $\$ 21.20$; 109 yards of cotton, $\$ 13.62$; painting, varnishing and cleaning Government house carriage, $\$ 10$; kitchen utensils, 837. Now, we pay Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney, as Lieutenant-Governor, $\$ t, 000$ a year; we pay him further, as commissioner, $\$ 3,200$ a year; and we pay him yearly for travelling expenses nearly $\$ 2,000$; we supply him with other contingencies required for travelling, such as horses, sleighs, buckboards, \&c., and surely he ought to wash his own blankets and varnish his own carriage, instead of charging these things to the Indian account. In 1882 the Indian account is charged for a horse for the commissioner, 8160 ; repairs to harnees, $\$ 18.25$; sundry articles, of which the items are not given, $\$ 146.45$; sundries again, $\$ 57.50$; two other horses,' $\$ 375$; two other horses for the commissioner's interpreter, $\$ 165$; two horses again for commissioner, $\$ 340$; two horses for Mr. Wadsworth, $\$ 110$. So that Mr. Dewdney, in that year, got from the Indian Department five horses for his own use that cost $\$ 775$, every one of which was charged to the Indian account. Why, in the name of common sense, should Commissioner Dewdney get out of the Indian fund five horses in one year, costing the people no less a sum than $\$ 775$. Mr. Wadsworth, who does a great deal more travelling and ten times the work that Mr. Dewdney does, got a span of horses for $\$ 110$ or $\$ 55$ each, while Mr. Dewdney's cost as high in one case as $\$ 170$ each. In 1883, the Indian account is charged with another horse for Mr. Dewdney at $\$: 00$, and again in the same year with a buckboard at $\$ 150$. Now, I state here that there is not a gentleman in this House, who knows anything about the North-West Territories, but who will declare that a buck board, fit for any gentleman to travel in, can be obtained there at from $\$ 40$ to $\$ 60$; yet the country is charged $\$ 150$ for this one. Mr. Dewdney also got another buckboard, in that year, at $\$ 80$, making two buckboards costing $\$ 230$, whicb were paid for out of the Indian fund, and which were charged to the Indian account. In the following year, I find charged to that account, one set of harness for the commissioner, 835 ; another horse for the commissioner, $\$ 150$; washing the towels of the commissioner, $\$ 6 ; 2$ waggons and harness for the two inspectors, \$528. I would like to know what kind of waggons were those two that cost $\$ 528$ ? In that year again, there is charged to Indian account, one buckboard, $\$ 117$; one waggon and harness, $\$ 100$; and another buckboard, $\$ 115$. In $18 \times 5$, another buckboard is charged to Indian account at $\$ 125$. In the report for 1886 , the same account is charged with one mare for commissioner, 8125 ; one pair of horses for Mr. McRae, $\$ 365$; one buckboard for Mr. McRae, \$90; one horse for Mr. McRae, $\$ 166$; one sleigh for commissioner, $\$ 40$. Why, every single thing is charged to the Indian account; yet Mr. Dewdney draws nearly $\$ 2,000$ a year for travelling ex penses. In the same year, we paid 81,192 to Baker \& Co., and others, for advances made, and this same year $\$ 20,150$ was charged to Indian account for travelling expenses. Among some of the items not open to discussion are the following: P. G. Williams, paid for travelling expenses
from Piegan Reserve to Crooked Lake, 8183 ; J. A. Hargrave, $\$ 125$ for one desk for Winnipeg office. Can you imagine, Sir, the kind of desk that would cest $\$ 125$ for an Indian office? My knowledge is too limited to evable me to grasp that great subject. Mr. Wadsworth was allowed $\$ 100$ for a buckboard - $\$ 40$ is the average price. I now come to a couple of other items, which will be found interesting. Three thou a and nine hundred and forty-eight dollars is charged as spent on potatoes for one band of Indians, the Indians under Treaty No. 4. The Indians under Trealy No. 6, are charged with $\$ 473.87$ for garden seeds in 1883 ; in 1884 the same Indians are charged with $\$ 742.89$ for garden seeds; and in 1855 , the same Indians are charged again with $\$ 811.78$ for garden seeds, so that, in the three years I have given, these Indians were charged with $\$ 2,0.7$ worth of garden seeds. I mean to say that the Indians never got these seeds to this extent, or if they did it was a scandalous waste of the public, or rather Indian, money. I mean to say, Sir, that $\$ 2,000$ worth of garden seeds would seed every garden in the whole North West, from the western boundary of Manitoba to the foot of the Rocky Monntains, and then leave enough to seed part of the Province of Ontario. And yet these Indians were charged with \$2,0-7 for garden seeds during the past three years. This item alune exhibits an extravagance, recklessners and waste on the part of the Admiuistration, which is simply incredible. It is simply disgraceful that any Government should tolerate this condition of affairs for a single year, and the fact that this Government has tolerated it reflects no credit upon them. I have thus shown by evidence which cannot be contradicted that the Indian service in the North-West is fillel with carpet-baggers and camp followers, with men incompetent to fulfil the duties they are called upon to disuharge, with men of bad habits and worse morals, with men who minimise the truth, with men who yet have not been able to distinguish between meum and tuum I have shown you that we have dealt harshly and cruelly with the Indians, that we have broken our solemn promises, that we have violated every line of every treaty that we made with the Indians, that we have permitted our agents and middlemen to rob and steal from the Indians, that our agents have allowed those Indians to be frozen to death and starved to death, and that in the midst of plenty. Sensible men, reasonable men foresaw long ago what would be the inevitable result of the foolish and mad policy pursued by this Administration towards the Indians, the policy of submission by a policy of starvation. Sensible men could see that the only ending would be that which was shown in the terrible outbreak of last year. Sənsible men can see now that the condition of the Indians there requires the earnest attention of this Parliament. Is it possible to open the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite? I have almost despaired of it. The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, in his report for 1886, says :

## "The Indians who rebelled do not plead grierances in extenaation of their having done so."

I know that the supporters of the Government, in Parliament and out of Parliament, and the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, and all those who clamored for the blood of Louis Riel, in order if possible to increase his criminality, have declared that, had it not been for him, the Indians of the North.West would not have taken up arms. That is true in a sense and it is not true. It is true that the action of Louis Riel was the spark which fired the train, but I say the combustible material was there all the same. It slumbered for seven years, but it only slumbered. It is not true that the action of Louis Riel was the only or the main cauce of the Indians joining their kindred, the half-breeds, in the recent insurrection in the North-West Territory. The Indian on the whole is a quiet, peaceable, law-abiding, loyal subject of Her Majesty the Queen, and it
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