

## Department of Agriculture—Archives.

C. 1824.

abuses to exist. If the charge be correct, why were the abuses allowed to continue? if otherwise, the representation should not have been forwarded. It is extraordinary to have complaints made at this distant period against Doucet's accounts which were signed by the chiefs, and that these should be forwarded without remark or explanation. The original account being approved by the commander of the forces did not preclude the propriety of demanding explanation on any point requiring it. The statement now under consideration is returned to him for examination and report. Doucet is to furnish last year's account without delay.

Page 402

Remarks (undated) respecting the appointment of Doucet and of his efforts to get rid of improper persons from the village of Caughnawaga.

406

Johnson to Darling, 22nd April, 1824. Regrets that his manner of forwarding the complaints of the Caughnawaga chiefs should have been disapproved, but the action should not have been a surprise as ever since the appointment of Doucet, his (Johnson's) representations were attributed to jealousy. Does not know the reason for supposing the complaints were drawn up to promote the interests of Archambault, therefore offers no opinion on the subject, but from the best information he can obtain, it appears that the charges on which he was rejected were fabricated in the interest of Doucet. Archambault's good conduct as agent. The complaint of the want of personal attendance on the part of Doucet is undoubtedly well founded, and his professional duties render him unfit for the office, whatever his other qualifications may be, as he cannot afford the time and personal attention that are requisite. Was not aware that Doucet's account had been made out till some time after it was forwarded. Had then writtin for a copy of it which was sent without explanation. It seems extraordinary that he should have sent the account direct, without intimating his intention, as he was in the habit of communicating with the office respecting his agency. It was with much surprise that he learned the chiefs had signed the account as they knew nothing of it, and when they got a copy were not satisfied with it. His refusal to interfere, the account having been approved by the commander of the forces. His reasons for the explanation and for not interfering with Doucet, as he does not wish to be subject to further indignities in respect to his (Doucet's) transactions with the Indians; shall as directed cause inquiry to be made into the complaints by the chiefs respecting Doucet's accounts and shall report.

411

Johnson to Darling, 24th April, 1824. Has received account from Doucet for last year; as it would be useless to ask the chiefs to sign this account before the other is settled, sends it to be examined and returned. Instead of the chiefs and Doucet meeting in his office they should meet in Council at Caughnawaga with one or more officers of the Indian department. If this course had been pursued before, it would have been productive of more satisfaction.

419

Officers of Indian Department to Johnson, 26th April, 1824. Have investigated the complaints of the chiefs at Caughnawaga and now send them; the chiefs are ready to make affidavit to the charges.

421

Report with complaint of the chiefs.

422

Account of the cash and wheat received from the Indians and from N. B. Doucet.

428

Johnson to Darling, 29th April, 1824. Sends report of the examination at Caughnawaga with remarks on Doucet's account.

430

Doucet to A. K. Johnson, 3rd May, 1824. Explains his accounts, repelling the charges against their correctness, with details.

437

Sir John Johnson to Darling, 8th May, 1824. Criticises Doucet's explanation, holding it to be unsatisfactory.

441