

Mr. FISHER. If Mr. Speaker says I am out of order, I will sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. If hon. members will permit me, I would suggest that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) ought to confine himself to a personal explanation. If he is anxious to carry the matter further, he can do so when we go into supply. I think that is the sense of the House.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to fall in with the suggestion of the Chair, having no wish to violate the rules of the House. But at present I merely wish to clear myself of the charge made by the minister—

Mr. CONMEE. And reopen the debate.

Mr. BRADBURY. Keep quiet. It will be necessary for me to show exactly how much land these Indians get. I can do that in a few minutes. William Prince, chief—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member must confine himself to a personal explanation. If he wants further opportunity he will—

Mr. BRADBURY. It is utterly impossible for me to explain the position without submitting the facts I have here. William Prince, chief—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BRADBURY. —and his wife—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) had better be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. Speaker, I was saying when I was interrupted that Chief William Prince had a wife and on her account he was entitled to 16 acres of land. Under the terms of the treaty he was entitled to 180 acres for himself, a total, 196 acres. Yet according to the minister's statement, he received 215 acres, or 19 acres more than he was entitled to. William H. Prince, councillor, had a wife, on whose account he was entitled to 16 acres. He himself was entitled to 120 acres, or a total of 136 acres. According to the statement of the minister, he received 172½ acres, or 36½ acres more than he was entitled to under the treaty. John Prince, councillor, had no wife, and was entitled to 120 acres. He received 136 acres, or 16

more than he was entitled to under the treaty. James Williams, councillor, had a wife and three children, on whose account he was entitled to 64 acres, together with 120 of his own account, a total of 184 acres. But he received, according to the minister's statement, 206½ acres, or 22½ acres more than he was entitled to. William Harper, councillor, was according to this sworn return, entitled to 16 acres on account of his wife, and 16 for one child. I may say in passing that the man had no wife; his wife was dead, and 120 acres for himself, he was entitled under his claim to only 152 acres. He received, according to the minister's statement, 232½ acres or 80½ acres more than he was entitled to. In these extra allotments four men received, not a hundred acres, as I stated to the House before. I was too moderate, for they did receive 174 acres more land than they were entitled to under the terms of the surrender, and I am now satisfied that that land supplied the money to pay the chief and council for betraying their band. The facts entirely justify my statement and prove the hon. minister entirely wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is my privilege—

Mr. SPEAKER. The minister can speak on a question of privilege, or give a personal explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no explanation to make, but my hon. friend has seen fit to revive a discussion which took place the other day, and it seems to me that if he wished to revive it he had much better have done it when the estimates were under discussion and when all these questions could be threshed out. If I am privileged, however, to continue this discussion—

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the circumstances the minister would do better to let the question stand, unless he wishes to avail himself of his right to give a personal explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I have nothing to explain, and nothing to apologize for. I do not wish to break the rules of the House for the purpose of keeping up a discussion which, it seems to me, occupied as much time of this House the other day as was fairly warranted under the circumstances; and unless my hon. friend can find some new matter to bring to the attention of the House on this occasion, I would suggest to him that he be merciful, even if he is strong.