

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PRIVACY

W
970
CS

R

(GE

N

1.
last
left
Gal
adv
affa
tere
Ind

2.
Sir
but
to
Ho
Vic
the
to
we
aft
exp
adv
ou

con
an
Co
co

PRIVATE.—For the use of the Committee.]

WSP
970-7

J. H. Powell

CS62 Church Missionary Society.

REPORT OF THE DEPUTATION TO METLAKATLA

(GENERAL TOUCH AND THE REV. W. R. BLACKETT).

1. Pursuant to the Committee's resolution of the 8th February last and the instructions in the address of the 8th March, we left Liverpool for New York on the 11th March. Sir Alexander Galt was a fellow-passenger on the *Germanic*, and strongly advised us to go to Ottawa *en route* to British Columbia, as the affairs of the Indians throughout British America were administered by Sir John Macdonald, as Superintendent-General of Indian affairs, and not by the Provincial Governments.

2. In accordance with that advice we proceeded to Ottawa. Sir John Macdonald was then too ill to see any one on business, but on a letter from the Lay Secretary, he had given instructions to his Deputy Minister, Mr. Van Koughnet, to write to the Honourable Mr. Trutch, agent for the Dominion Government at Victoria, and to Dr. Powell, the Indian Commissioner, requesting them to furnish us with all necessary information, and generally to assist us in the fulfilment of the object of our mission. We were accordingly furnished with letters to these functionaries, after an encouraging interview with the Deputy Minister, who expressed his interest in the result of our mission, and specially adverted with satisfaction to our effort to obtain a residence for our sole occupation while at Metlakatla.

3. On our arrival at Victoria, where we spent eight days, we conferred with Mr. Trutch and Dr. Powell, and with the Premier, and the several officers of the Provincial Government of British Columbia, who manifested every disposition to assist us with copies of Government records bearing on the Metlakatla troubles—heard our views on the question, as far as we were then in a

Pacific N. W. History Dept.
PROVINCIAL LIBRARY
VICTORIA, B. C.

position to offer them—and accorded to us every encouragement and courtesy which it was in their power to offer.

4. We also conferred with other parties, friends of the Society and supporters of Mr. Duncan, and we found that in the minds of the latter especially, there was considerable misapprehension as to the past action of the Committee, which we endeavoured to remove.

5. By the first steamer after our arrival at Victoria, we proceeded to Metlakatla, where we were very cordially received, not only by the Indians who adhere to the Society, but by those also who seceded with Mr. Duncan. A party of the latter, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather and darkness of the evening, met us on the beach on landing from the Bishop's boat, and carried up our luggage to a house belonging to one of the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan, which, through his good offices, was kindly vacated for us by the owner, Mrs. James O'Reilly, a widow—and prepared for our occupation by Mrs. Tomlinson, with every regard to our comfort.

5a. As we had been led by Mr. Duncan to expect, we found that there were very few Indians in Metlakatla when we arrived on the 19th April, and we had a day or two to get information and to see something of the village—which has a frontage of about two-thirds of a mile, with very little depth—before the Indians returned from the annual ocean fishing on the Naas River.

6. We observed that several canoes daily came in from the north, and on the 22nd Mr. Tomlinson called in the afternoon and informed us that there were about as many Indians then present as we should find at any one time in the place, for although many were absent in quest of seals and fur-bearing animals, those who had returned would shortly leave again for salmon-fishing and work at the canneries, which are in operation towards the end of May. We therefore arranged a meeting with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan exclusively, at eight o'clock the same evening. They wished the meeting to be restricted to themselves alone.

7. Mr. Tomlinson informed us that David Leask would interpret our addresses, to which arrangement we gladly assented, but observed that we should require a competent interpreter to be present in the interests of the Church Missionary Society—not necessarily to interpret, but to assure us that our addresses were accurately communicated to the Indians. To this, Mr. Tomlinson, on behalf of the Indians, at first demurred, as an arrangement that would be distasteful to them; but on its being stated by us to be essential, he promised to explain to the Indians our reasons; and it was so arranged. We obtained the

service
Societ
habit
the B
Book,
readin
dispos
8.
being
us—t
interp
9.
Toml
Mr. I
seeme
of the
invol
Appe
10
ing,
other
India
addr
that
acco
even
11
Indi
migh
Apr
12
writ
Apr
prep
beh
with
cati
writ
in
arra
1
ans
the
ten
tion
sho

services of Mrs. Odill Morrison, a lady in full sympathy with the Society, and very competent to perform the duty, being in the habit of interpreting in judicial proceedings. She has assisted the Bishop in the translation of the Gospels and the Prayer-Book, and we have great pleasure in here acknowledging the readiness with which she very kindly placed her services at our disposal throughout our stay in Metlakatla.

8. We met the Indians at eight o'clock, and David Leask being absent—although another interpreter was suggested by us—the Indians preferred that Mrs. Morrison should be the interpreter.

9. There were about sixty-four Indians present, with Mr. Tomlinson and Dr. Bluett, the medical missionary attached to Mr. Duncan's party, and we addressed them on such points as seemed to require elucidation, as a preliminary to a discussion of the particular causes of the troubles in which they had been involved for several years. Our addresses will be found in Appendix A.

10. These addresses had not previously been reduced to writing, as the notice had been so short, but we "reported" each other's addresses, and after they were delivered we invited the Indians to put questions. They asked to have a copy of our addresses, that they might consider them deliberately, and said that they would afterwards ask questions, if they desired. We accordingly furnished them with a copy on the following evening.

11. We were afterwards informed by Mr. Tomlinson that the Indians were considering our addresses, and that some days might elapse before they were prepared to reply. On the 27th April we received their answer in writing. (*Vide* Appendix B.)

12. As it was the desire of the Indians to have everything in writing, we prepared a joint reply to their letter of the 27th April, and on the 30th informed Mr. Tomlinson that it had been prepared, and that we wished to meet the Indians. He, on their behalf, desired that it should be handed over to the Indians without a meeting, but we insisted that all our formal communications with the Indians should be *vivâ voce* (though reduced to writing), and in the presence of a competent interpreter attending in the interests of the Church Missionary Society, and it was arranged that Mrs. Morrison should again interpret.

13. At eight o'clock p.m. we again met the Indians, and our answer (Appendix C) was read and interpreted to them. It was then handed over to John Tait, their spokesman. From the tenor of their first letter it was evident that these communications might very soon cease, and it was important that we should deal at once and fully with all the questions upon which

it was necessary to address the Indians. It will be observed that in replying to the letter of the 27th we dealt with questions which seriously affected Mr. Duncan, which we should much rather have done in his presence. When we met him in London we pressed upon him the great importance of his presence when we were at Metlakatla. He promised to be there before the 1st May, if he could. He was doubtful, but proposed to consult his friends, engaging to let us know the result, and he took our addresses. We did not hear from him before we left London, and we were altogether uninformed of his plans. We had been at Metlakatla for three weeks before he arrived, and he was under the impression that we might be leaving by the steamer which brought him, and proposed to call on us the same evening. We, however, informed him that we should remain till the following steamer arrived. We were six weeks at Metlakatla. He remarked that he thought it better that he should be absent while our inquiry proceeded, which, as he was aware, did not accord with our opinion or wishes, and, moreover, did not accord with the understanding with himself.

14. After our address had been read, and the Indians did not avail themselves of our offer to answer any questions, we proposed to close the meeting, when Mr. Tomlinson, addressing us, but turning to the Indians, said, in a very excited manner and loud tone of voice, that we had slandered his friend Mr. Duncan behind his back, and called him "a liar and a thief." We pointed out to him quietly the groundlessness of his accusation, but without avail. His efforts to rouse the Indians, to whom we heard him vociferating after we left, did not apparently succeed, as they were afterwards as cordial as before.

15. He subsequently stated to us, that the Indians as well as he, considered that we imputed fraud to Mr. Duncan, an imputation which, as will be observed, is not to be found in our address; but to give the Indians no grounds for supposing that we meant more than we said we addressed to them our letter of 3rd May (Appendix D), and to Mr. Tomlinson our note of the same date (Appendix E).

16. The Indians replied to our address in their letter of 4th May (Appendix F), which was accompanied by Mr. Tomlinson's note (Appendix G), and covered by Mr. Tomlinson's letter of the same date (Appendix H), justifying a statement in the letter from the Indians "that they had never been asked to join the Church of England." It had not been alleged by us that they had.

17. Hoping that Mr. Duncan would himself arrive by the first steamer, we deferred further communication with the Indians and Mr. Tomlinson. Mr. Duncan having arrived, and not being desirous of meeting us with the Indians, we replied to both

Mr. T
(Appe
and d
steama
And c
us his
he rep
he ha
Comr
appea
18.
by w
betw
adhe
neces
peac
jecti
Simp
asce
mit
19
part
was
the
in t
the
trat
app
mar
Gov
lak
adu
me
wa
Ch
cor
in
cle
au
to
m
re
ec
C

Mr. Tomlinson and the Indians in our letter of 20th May (Appendix I), which we supposed had closed the correspondence and discussion. Mr. Tomlinson was a fellow-passenger on the steamer from Metlakatla—which we left on 1st June—for Victoria. And on the 4th, the day before we reached Victoria, he handed us his letter of 2nd June (Appendix J), in which it will be observed he repudiates our construction of the Committee's circular letters he had quoted. As we believed we were in possession of the Committee's views, and had stated them, any reply did not appear to be called for.

18. Our principal object was to bring about an arrangement by which peace on a sound scriptural basis might be established between the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan and those who adhere to the Church Missionary Society, and to that end it was necessary fully to ascertain the causes of the troubles and dispeace that prevailed. By careful inquiry and observation, rejecting hearsay and rumour, not only at Metlakatla, but at Fort Simpson, Kincolith, and Port Essington, which were visited, we ascertained what the causes of these troubles are, and now submit the result of our inquiry.

19. While we think there can be no doubt that in the early part of the mission history, a great and generally sound work was carried on by Mr. Duncan, we also see reason to believe that the amount of attention given to the secular part of the work, in the development of industries, was given at some sacrifice to the spiritual work. The civilizing effects of Mr. Duncan's administration, however, was so strikingly successful, that it was greatly appreciated and highly commended by Government, and for many years he appears to have enjoyed the entire confidence of Government as well as of the Committee.

20. The removal of the Mission from Fort Simpson to Metlakatla, which became a Christian village, to which none were admitted without engaging to abide by the rules of the settlement, placed Mr. Duncan in a position in which his power was practically absolute, and the inherent defects of the Christian-village system are now manifest in the dependent condition of the Indians, as they have been in similar villages in India.

21. It is true that the Committee provided a succession of clerical missionaries to share the responsibility of the Mission, and especially of the spiritual teaching; but a strong will, accustomed to the exercise of control in both secular and spiritual matters—entirely trusted by Government and the Committee, and removed from the observation of any authority, governmental or ecclesiastical—to a great extent neutralized the intentions of the Committee, and has unhappily acquired a force that—directed as

it now is—is, we regret to say, undoing the great work which God enabled that will, for a time, to accomplish.

22. It may appear to those who have actually known the Mission that we underrate the progress that had been made in the spiritual life. We have observed the mode of teaching and the actual work, and are convinced that they are not calculated to promote scriptural knowledge and spiritual life. Although the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan have had the benefit of his teaching for upwards of twenty-eight years, they have not yet had any portion of the Word of God, in their own tongue, put into their hands. Mr. Duncan's defence is that he did not dare to translate the Word of God into a rude language like Tsimpshéan, which contains no terms to express many of those which occur in Scripture—a plea which is negatived by experience; but it is to be observed that Mr. Duncan incurs a much greater responsibility by continuing to teach only by word of mouth, translating at the moment the Word of God, and by allowing those who have a very slender knowledge of English to teach in the Sunday-school in Tsimpshéan, with only an English Bible in their hands. We found John Tait—one of the most advanced of the party—so teaching. His knowledge of English is, as we found, very imperfect, and when giving evidence before the Government Commission in November, 1884, he pleaded that he did not speak English. He was therefore sworn and examined through an interpreter. Mr. Duncan, when we met him in England and questioned him on this subject, represented that the Indians were rapidly acquiring a knowledge of English, and would soon be able to use the English Bible. Apart from the consideration that it is now admitted that if the Bible is to be generally read and understood it must be supplied in the native tongue of the people, Mr. Duncan's representation is not supported by fact, as we found that but a small proportion of the Indians know English, and those few far too imperfectly to use with profit an English Bible. All the classes that we saw were being taught through the Tsimpshéan language from the English Bible, and that by persons having generally but a very elementary knowledge of English, who were required off-hand—with probably previous preparation—to translate that which Mr. Duncan shrinks from translating deliberately. It will be obvious that what is reduced to writing, however imperfect, is subject to criticism by other scholars, and susceptible of revision. The fact that Bishop Ridley, with efficient aid, has translated three gospels and a considerable portion of the Prayer-Book, and that the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Morning and Evening Services abridged have been printed, and are now in use with the Indians attached to the Society with acceptance and advantage, goes far

to rel
long
23.
visite
ticular
recei
of kn
obser
could
Dunc
any
thes
The
any
catic
and
defin
are
2.
Ind
sup
Ind
wer
stat
to
unc
of M
reas
con
is n
of t
adu
the
sac
obv
Mi
oth
dic
be
the
the
be
ov
go
th
pe

to refute the plea on which this very essential work has been so long deferred.

23. We can readily understand how some who had previously visited the Mission, but had not their attention drawn to particular points, or authority to make any effectual inquiry, received a different impression of the work and of the standard of knowledge really possessed by the Indians; but our continued observation during our stay, and communication with the people, could not fail to convince us that they are so dependent on Mr. Duncan and Mr. Tomlinson, that what is done at Metlakatla in any matter of importance, ostensibly by the Indians, is done by these gentlemen either by immediate or previous inculcation. The Indians are but children, and quite incapable of acting in any important matter for themselves. Their written communications to us, therefore, must be looked upon as, in substance and diction, the communications of Mr. Tomlinson, and any definite ideas they have on the subjects we proposed to discuss are those they have received directly from their teachers.

24. On the subject of withholding the Lord's Supper from the Indians for all these years, Mr. Duncan pleaded the danger of superstitious observance, and the inconsistency of allowing the Indians to touch an alcoholic beverage, from which by law they were excluded. We do not think it necessary to do more than state the latter plea; but with respect to the former we have to observe that the danger is one which, in the case of these uncivilized races, has not been specially experienced in the history of Missions, and appears to us to be altogether insufficient as a reason for countenancing the neglect of our Lord's direct command, much less for encouraging such neglect, and the plea is negatived, even at Metlakatla, by actual experience, in the case of those Indians who are attached to the Society. Mr. Duncan admitted to us in England, on being pressed on the subject, that the introduction of a clergyman in a surplice to administer the sacrament was, in his opinion, fraught with danger, and as it is obvious that none other could, in a Mission of the Church Missionary Society, his admission explains his continued and otherwise unintelligible objection to the administration at all. He did, however, also admit that some of the Indians might properly be admitted to the privilege, but urged that on consulting them they desired to defer their own admission out of consideration for their heathen brethren. It appears to us that Mr. Duncan must bear the responsibility of the influence which he claims to possess over these Indians and others on the coast, and which we have good reason for believing he did possess, and that in considering this and other points where he is disposed to plead their independent judgment, the effects of his teaching cannot be dis-

regarded. In this case it was obviously his duty as a spiritual teacher to instruct the Indians in the nature of the rite, and to inculcate obedience to our Lord's command upon those whom he believed to be true children of God, and who as such would be worthy partakers of the Lord's Supper, and to throw on them the responsibility of neglect—not to go through the form of consulting them on such a point. They could scarcely fail to decide in accordance with his own views and teaching.

25. On the subject of baptism we found that he had endeavoured to substitute the "blessing" of infants for baptism; his own desire being that baptism should be deferred till the subjects had come to years to answer for themselves, but that in only one case was the "blessing" carried out, as it met with so strong opposition from the Indians themselves, that he had to abandon the idea of the change on this important point.

26. Had we found it practicable to establish any understanding with Mr. Duncan and Mr. Tomlinson, and with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan, that would tend to peace, it might have been unnecessary to enter at length into the different subjects on which Mr. Duncan was at issue with the Society, but it will be clear from the communications we have received, that there is an expressed determination to persevere in what we can only consider as the inculcation and practice of opposition to the laws of God and man, and it has become necessary fully to explain wherein such tendencies have been and are being developed, that the measures necessary for suppressing the evil now going on may be understood.

27. Mr. Duncan arrived at Metlakatla on the 10th May. We were aware that he had brought with him freight for the cannery, and that his attention would be occupied with this industry after his arrival. We called on him that evening, and informed him that when the pressure of work admitted of it, we should be glad to see him. As up to the 13th he did not appear, we ascertained from him that he was still occupied, and we therefore on that day went to Port Essington, promising to advise him of our return. On the morning of the 19th he was informed of our return. He still pleaded occupation, but as our time was passing he was pressed for an interview, and it was arranged that we should meet at eight o'clock the same evening. We met accordingly, and the interview lasted about six hours and a half. We considered that the best course was to inform Mr. Duncan of what we had learned on, we believed, good authority, and offer him the opportunity of contradicting or explaining the particular allegations which had been made to his disadvantage.

28. As regards the claim of the Indians to the two acres, generally known as Mission Point, he still adhered to his opinion

that the Indians had a proprietary right in the soil, and acknowledged that he had so informed them. He had mentioned to us in England that if Government negated the claim, he would himself take the question into court, and on that being alluded to as rendering discussion unnecessary, he stated that the proceeding must be in the form of an action by the Dominion Government against the Provincial, at his instance, and this they were prepared to institute when the demand should be made by him; a measure which we consider highly improbable.

29. We referred to his statement to us in England of the circumstances attending his severance from the Society, which gave us the impression that the Bishop had had only one interview with him, which he informed us was on the beach, while he was closely occupied in landing and checking sixty tons of machinery for the cannery, and at which the sealed letter was abruptly handed to him by the Bishop, on his informing him that he could not, as desired by the Committee, go home then. We stated to him what we had ascertained from the Bishop himself, and was partly corroborated by others, viz., that on the evening the steamer arrived; the Bishop informed him that he had received an important communication in respect to him from the Committee; that he would not trouble him with it that evening, but would see him in the morning; that on the following morning the Bishop saw Mr. Duncan in his own room in the mission-house, and in the most considerate terms informed him of the requirement of the Committee that he should either go home for conference or consent to carry on the Mission work on the lines of the Church Missionary Society; that Mr. Duncan replied that he could not go home, and that he had written fully to the Committee from Victoria, explaining his views, and that from these he could not depart; that on being again asked if he would not consent to go home, he positively refused to do so; that the Bishop begged him to think over the matter and he would see him again; that the Bishop, after a lapse of from one to two hours went to him again, when Mr. Duncan declined to have any further communication with him, and he had no alternative but to give him the sealed letter disconnecting him.

Mr. Duncan to us in England represented that the Bishop was inconsiderate and abrupt in his manner, and he stated that the stay of the steamer was so short that he could not interrupt the lauding of the machinery, but he made no mention of any interview save that on the beach, nor of the fact that the Bishop had himself to leave by the steamer for Kincolith, and gave him all the consideration in respect to time of which the circumstances admitted. Mr. Duncan did not deny the correctness of the Bishop's statement, and we asked him whether he had informed

the Bishop that in his letter to the Committee he had expressed his willingness to go home after his responsibilities at Victoria, in regard to the machinery, were fulfilled, if, after his full explanation of his views, they still wished it. He at first answered evasively, saying that he had given the Bishop the purport of his letter, and on being questioned more particularly still gave that answer. And it was not till a stern, "Did you, or did you not?" had been repeated that he acknowledged that he could not say he did. To induce a direct reply it was explained to him that the point was very material, as on it hinged the question of full effect having been given to the intentions of the Committee.

29a. After this interview the Bishop informed us that Mr. Duncan read the sealed letter in his presence, and said to him, "You have exceeded your instructions;" but folded up the letter hastily, with the remark that the matter was settled.

30. The action of the Society and of the Bishop had been much misunderstood and misrepresented among Mr. Duncan's friends at home and in Victoria, and these misrepresentations had found currency for several years, doubtless in consequence of the reluctance of the Committee to take any action which would have precluded the hope of that peaceable adjustment of matters which they earnestly desired to see, but it is important that the facts should be now fully known to those who have any responsibility in further dealing with the case.

31. Mr. Duncan was next asked as to the abstraction of twelve pages of the Society's account book, which it was alleged he had cut out. He asked us who had informed us of that. Mr. Collison, whom we invited to come from Kincolith to meet us, had explained to us that in taking over the books from Mr. Duncan, Mr. Duncan retained that particular book on the plea of enabling him to take a copy of the "Secular Fund account" of the Society. On the book being afterwards handed over, Mr. Collison found that the pages referred to, which contained that account, had been cut out, and on his asking an explanation Mr. Duncan said that they contained matters of no interest to anybody but himself. With reference to Mr. Duncan's statement, we have to explain that at the request of the Lay Secretary we took over the books from Dr. Praeger at Victoria on our way out, and observed that the twelve pages had been closely cut out of the book. The page at the commencement of the book, indicating its contents, which we were informed by Mr. Collison was in Mr. Duncan's handwriting, bears the subjoined inscription,—

"Church Missionary Society's Account Book with Metlakatla Mission, British Columbia, containing,—

The ac
to hav
presun
that p
the pr

We
tion, a
him b
that h

allega
accoun
questi
by a l

whole
attent
referen
tion o
which
that v

It is
attitu
on t
regan

appa
to co
Se
his e
after
unre
furth

32
char
resp
rece
spec
Sept

infor
up t
of th
he a
your

3
man

"(1) Account Currents from 1857.

"(2) Secular Fund Account..

" See page 51."

The account abstracted is therefore acknowledged by Mr. Duncan to have been an account of the Society, which might have been presumed from its existence in that book, but, irrespective of that point, the book which has been mutilated is unquestionably the property of the Society, and not of Mr. Duncan.

We informed him that Mr. Collison had given us the information, and referred to the fact that the act had been imputed to him before the Government Commission in November, 1884, and that he had not disputed the statement. He did not deny the allegation, but in reply to our question said that in regard to accounts or figures he declined to give any answer unless the questions were put in writing, and then he would answer them by a book which he pointed to, and which he said contained the whole history of the Mission, and was to be published. We drew attention to the fact that the question was not one that had any reference to figures, but was a simple question as to the abstraction of the Society's property. He adhered to his conditions, which we declined to accept as unreasonable, and informed him that we should record that he had declined to answer the question. It is obvious that we could not cross-examine a book, and his attitude distinctly implied an unwillingness to answer questions on this point or on the subject of the accounts, his evidence regarding which, before the Commission given upon oath and apparently believed by the Indians, it was our unpleasant duty to contradict in our last address to them.

Several questions in respect to the accounts with reference to his evidence were noted with the view of being put to him, but after receiving the above answer, and on his persisting in his unreasonable conditions, it was useless to carry the matter further.

32. The next subject on which we questioned him was the charge in the accounts for the boarding of "children," not in respect to the charges, but with reference to information we had received that the children were mostly young women, and we specified the entry in the accounts for the year ending 30th September, 1866, of "fifteen children," of whom we were informed the youngest was twelve, and the others ranged in age up to twenty-five or thirty, Indians having no accurate knowledge of their own age or that of others. We were also informed that he alone for several years occupied the mission-house with these young women.

33. He admitted the facts, and in a perfectly straightforward manner said, that whatever might be thought of the arrangement,

he had continued what had been begun at his instance by Mrs. Tugwell, at Fort Simpson, to save girls from the extreme temptations to which they were exposed. On being asked if he had represented the circumstances of the case to the Committee, he mentioned that he had done so, and had described the style of person who should be sent out to superintend the institution.

34. Having heard that Mr. Duncan had exercised the power of divorce, we questioned him on that subject, citing the cases of Edmund Verney and Richard Cecil, whose wives he was alleged to have taken from them and married to other men. He did not admit that he divorced the parties, but he admitted that Edmund Verney had been lawfully married, and that in consequence of his long-continued infidelity and indifference to admonition he had married his wife to a French Canadian now resident at Metlakatla. Mr. Duncan at first questioned whether Richard Cecil had been lawfully married, but on our giving him the alleged facts, and naming the clergyman by whom they were said to have been married, he admitted that they might have been, and gave the same reason for marrying the woman to another man.

He did explain that he had done these things when the Indians were in a less advanced state, and that he would not feel justified in adopting the same course under present circumstances; but with all allowance for the recognized hardships involved in such cases, and the difficulties of equitably dealing with them among uncivilized nations, we cannot but express our extreme surprise that Mr. Duncan, with God's Word before him, took upon himself unlawfully to unite women, already lawfully married to husbands by Christian marriage, to other men, and neither referred such questions to the Bishop of the diocese nor to the Committee, nor indeed to any authority.

35. We questioned Mr. Duncan in regard to the marriage of Frank Allen and Mary Jackson, after Mr. Collison, as a clergyman, under the advice of the Bishop, had refused to marry them.

Mr. Duncan justified his procedure on the score of discipline. He had sent Mary Jackson, who was one of the young women referred to, to Victoria, at his own expense, to be trained as a pupil-teacher. On her return she had been seduced by Frank Allen in the dormitory. Mr. Duncan took an I.O.U. from Allen for \$300 (never actually paid) to compensate him for the cost of her education, and insisted on their being married at once. They were desirous of being married, but not at once, as they wished to have the usual feast on the occasion, and Mr. Collison objected to marry them against their will. On Mr. Duncan pressing the matter, Mr. Collison sought the advice of the Bishop (who concurred in his objection), and communicated the result to Mr.

Duncan.
Allen at
week, as
36.
the cou
Mission
measure
Mission
Mr. Du
same ti
Mr.
Stanley
all the
also all
default
was gi
as an o
actors
ment k
Victor
ground
under
mitted
37.
to the
if he c
conne
do so,
India
menti
Dunc
court
38.
Mr. I
ment
be in
with
first
be in
in o
mina
poss
that
and
us th
the

Duncan. Mr. Duncan then married them himself; sent Frank Allen at once to jail for a week, and on his release his wife for a week, as a punishment for the immorality.

36. We questioned him as to Ada Stanley's punishment by the council, who fined her \$2½ for buying sugar at the Church Mission Stores, conducted under the direction of the Bishop as a measure of defence against the insults to which the Church Mission Indians were subjected when making purchases at Mr. Duncan's stores. Emily Rees was also fined \$2½ at the same time for obtaining sugar through Ada Stanley.

Mr. Duncan justified the procedure on the ground that Ada Stanley violated one of the regulations of the settlement which all the Indians were bound to obey or to leave Metlakatla; and he also alleged that the shawl which was taken from Ada Stanley in default of payment was voluntarily given, but in point of fact it was given to avoid imprisonment, on failure to pay the fine which, as an orphan, she had not the means of paying. The two principal actors in the transaction were tried and sentenced to imprisonment by the stipendiary magistrate, but appealed to the court at Victoria, by whose order they were released on the technical ground that it was not within the competence of the magistrate, under the new Act, to try the case, which he should have committed for trial at Victoria.

37. Having ascertained that Mr. Duncan had read the addresses to the Indians, and as these affected him personally, we asked him if he desired to meet us with the Indians to discuss any point connected with the management of the Mission. He declined to do so, and the case, as between him and the Society and the Indians attached to him, remains as now stated. We ought to mention that notwithstanding the plain dealing to which Mr. Duncan was subjected during the interview, his bearing was courteous throughout.

38. It is a source of great regret to us to have to report that Mr. Duncan's attitude offers no ground of hope of any arrangement with him. His views and procedure are such that it would be impossible for the Society in any way to identify itself with his action. Both his and Mr. Tomlinson's policy was at first to put us to the proof as to statements which they knew to be in accordance with fact, but after finding we had the proofs in our own hands they abandoned this procedure. Their determination, however, to maintain their claim to the exclusive possession of the Metlakatla Mission without regard to the fact that the Mission is a Mission of the Society and was established and has been maintained at the Society's expense, devolved upon us the duty of considering the course best calculated to relieve the Indians attached to the Society from the disabilities under

which they now labour, and to secure for them the protection of the law. It will be observed that appended to the letter of the Indians of the 4th May (Appendix F) is a formal notice to the Committee and representatives of the Society to quit Metlakatla, and that is the point for which Mr. Duncan is now contending.

39. It is necessary to explain how Mr. Duncan's principles and proceedings render peaceful agreement impossible, apart even from his claim to oust the Society from the two acres. Under his guidance regulations have been established forbidding any persons to build houses, even on sites already in their possession, or to alter, finish, or enlarge their existing houses, unless they agree with the majority in doctrine and unite with them in worship. Mr. Duncan bases this demand on the principle that in such a community there can be no civil unity unless there is religious; a principle destructive either of conscience or of union, and absolutely opposed to civil or religious liberty. Nor is this a mere paper regulation. It has been enforced by the violent and riotous pulling down of a room which one of the C.M.S. Christians had added to his house, and by threats in other cases. In our second interview with the Indians we brought this matter earnestly before them, pointing out that nothing was really necessary for the establishment of peace but the withdrawal of their illegal and un-Christian regulations. Their only reply was that their community was founded upon unity, and that for unity they would continue to contend. In our interview with Mr. Duncan an earnest appeal was made to him also as to these regulations. After changing his ground several times, he finally refused absolutely to withdraw the regulations or even to use his influence with the Indians to do so. This was to us a matter of extreme regret, putting an end to all hope of an amicable arrangement, whereby the Society's work could be carried on at Metlakatla side by side with Mr. Duncan's. We cannot understand why Mr. Duncan should refuse so moderate a request if he did not feel, what we believe to be the fact, that his hold upon the majority depends upon the continuance of this system of terrorism, for which these regulations furnish the principal engine, though not the only one. Our only consolation is that by this action of Mr. Duncan, the position of the Society is placed in its true light. And it is made clear that the Society is the defender at Metlakatla of religious liberty. The Tsimpshean Indians are our fellow-subjects as well as our fellow-Christians, and all that we ask for them is freedom to worship God according to their consciences.

40. Mr. Duncan's proceedings, as illustrated by the cases above cited, are so arbitrary and lawless that, in the absence of any representative of Government, his will is practically the only

authority which prevails at Metlakatla. Bishop Ridley has, as the Committee are aware, with unwearied zeal and courage maintained the Society's position for these five years, and kept together the Indians who adhere to the Society, but the Bishop cannot deal with the system of persecution which has been resorted to against the minority, which can only be repressed by the civil power.

41. We therefore, on our arrival at Victoria, addressed our letter of the 7th June (Appendix K) to the Government of British Columbia, furnishing them with a copy of the record of our formal proceedings with the Indians, and invoking the interposition of that Government to protect the Indians attached to the Society, and communicated personally with the Premier, the Provincial Secretary, and with Mr. Trutch and Dr. Powell. We also, on the 8th of June, addressed Sir John Macdonald (Appendix L), furnished him also with a copy of the above record, and recommended the application to our Missions of the Indian Act, and the appointment of an Indian agent to give effect to the provisions of that act—a measure which Mr. Duncan has hitherto successfully deprecated. That letter, with its enclosures, on our arrival at Ottawa we delivered personally to Sir John Macdonald, with whom we had an interview, as well as with the Deputy Minister, and it was with great satisfaction that we learned from both that the measure we recommended had already been determined on, and that an Indian agent and stipendiary magistrate would shortly be established in the Missions. Sir John himself was about to visit British Columbia, and was to give his personal attention to the subject.

42. Mr. Duncan's council, under this arrangement, will give place to a council legally constituted under the Act, and presided over by the Indian agent, and it appears to us that this is the remedy for the illegalities from which the adherents of the Society have hitherto suffered at Metlakatla. The jail will be under the control of the stipendiary magistrate instead of Mr. Duncan, whose functions will be restricted to those of a missionary, under which arrangement his influence for evil over the Indians and his efforts to enforce his claim to the exclusive possession of Metlakatla will become inoperative.

43. Under such an arrangement we believe the Society has only to follow its course, with care and discretion on the part of its agents, and that, notwithstanding the special inducements Mr. Duncan offers to the Indians in the form of remunerative employment, which are not great, the Mission may yet, under God's blessing, bear the fruit of which at one time it gave so much promise. After our residence among the Indians, and our informal and unrestricted intercourse with those attached to the

Society, we have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the work done among the latter is sound and very encouraging. There is a marked contrast between those attached to the Society and the majority. The general appearance and straightforward bearing of the former impressed us favourably, while, on the other hand, we brought to the notice of Mr. Tomlinson that the course pursued in respect to the majority was demoralizing to their own agents, citing the case of David Leask, who, in the trial regarding the breaking into the school-house to screen Mr. Duncan and Mr. Tomlinson from the responsibilities of complicity with the writing of a letter which was characterized as felonious, gave false evidence on oath,—yet David Leask preached the sermon at one of the services in the church at Metlakatla while we were there, and Frederic Ridley, one of the ringleaders in the riots, preached the sermon on another occasion. We have no reason to believe that these men are bad specimens of the Indian community, but the influences to which they are subjected under the system which prevails can scarcely fail to subvert a regard for truth and foster hypocrisy.

44. We cannot conclude our report without avowing our belief, in the face of this state of declension, that, if Mr. Duncan had done nothing else, he is entitled to the cordial thanks of all who are interested in the welfare of the Indians on the north-western coast, for the manly and courageous spirit in which, in the early period of the Mission, he strenuously contended against the liquor traffic on the coast, which was carried on by unscrupulous speculators, who for their own profit disregarded the pernicious effects of the traffic on the bodies and souls of these races, and by his persistent efforts shut out such supplies from Metlakatla, and largely contributed to the abolition of the traffic.

45. It is with sorrow that we have had to report in terms which so seriously affect Mr. Duncan's character as a Christian missionary. Such a course is the only one which consists with our duty, in the performance of which, under a deep sense of responsibility, we trust we have been guided by Him in whom alone there is wisdom and judgment.

J. G. TOUCH.
W. R. BLACKETT.

5th July, 1886.

REI
G
have
the S
is all
the r
year
over
Thes
have
parts
sions
Ceyl
Lond
of th
of tw
may
name
sit.
Chic
Lond
know
that
know
Com
show
of th
have
way
Seve
in I
the
about
thre
read
one
resid
N
way

APPENDIX A.

REPORTS OF ADDRESSES TO THE "DUNCAN'S INDIANS," AT METLAKATLA, ON 22ND APRIL, 1886.

GENERAL TOUCH said :—My Friends, I wish to explain to you why we have come from England. In order to make this clear I will explain what the Society is, and what the Committee is. The Church Missionary Society is all those persons who give us money for Mission work. The account of the money is contained in these 200 pages of this book, which is last year's Report. One is published every year. The money last year was over a million dollars. The people who give this are the Society. These appoint the Committee, or Council, in London. The Committee have all this money sent to them, and they distribute it in different parts of the world where the missionaries are working. We have Missions in many parts: India, British North America, China, Japan, Ceylon, the Holy Land, and some other places. The Committee in London manages all the affairs of the Society. I speak as a member of the Committee, as well as of the Deputation. The Committee consists of twenty-four laymen, and all clergymen who give money to the Society may sit on the Committee if they please. The laymen are appointed by name, but any clergyman by only paying money acquires the right to sit. There is a President of the Society. The late President, Lord Chichester, who had been President fifty-one years, died since I left London, and no new President has yet been appointed, as far as I know. I have received a notice that the Committee would meet about that matter, and a new President will be appointed shortly. I do not know who he will be. I cannot tell you who all the clergymen on the Committee are, but here in the Report is a list of all the laymen. To show you what sort of people they are, I may tell you that some of them are generals in the army, some are barristers and solicitors, some have been judges. One is an engineer, whom I met at Liverpool on my way out, and who has just finished the tunnel under the River Mersey. Several are merchants; several are men who have been in the Civil Service in India; all are men of experience. There is only one youngish man on the Committee, and he has been appointed lately. He is aged, I think, about thirty-five. They are generally old men like myself, of sixty-three or so. I will lay the book here on the table, and any who can read English can see it. I cannot send it round, because I have only one copy and have to use it, but any one can see it at my present residence.

Now I will tell you why Mr. Blackett and I are here. The best way to explain it will be to do it in regular form, and read the resolu-

tion of the Committee by which we were appointed. When that resolution was passed, on February the 8th, I was out speaking for the Society at a town in England, and so I was absent from that meeting. There are seven secretaries. The chief of them is Mr. Wigram, and he wrote to me this letter:—

“After a good discussion the Committee to-day unanimously resolved, ‘That having regard to the great importance of putting an end as speedily as possible to the long-continued tension at Metlakatla, this Committee invite General Touch and the Rev. W. R. Blackett, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Nottingham, to visit Metlakatla, and to confer with the Provincial Government, the Bishop, the Christians who adhere to the Society, and those who have seceded with Mr. Duncan, and others, with a view to assist the Committee in determining what action should be taken.’”

Let me explain that the Committee cannot, of course, *order* any persons who are not under them, so that this resolution cannot be understood to apply to any persons who are not willing to be under them, but the Committee has to decide as to its own people what has to be done.

In 1856, thirty years ago, the Committee sent out Mr. Duncan to Fort Simpson. Afterwards, as you know, he removed, with the Committee’s sanction, to Metlakatla. Then he for many years did good work here under the Committee. Therefore the Committee can never help feeling an interest in all the people in Metlakatla, whether they cleave to the Society or to any other person. The object of the Committee then in sending Mr. Duncan was to do you good, to teach you God’s Word and His truth. That was the first thing. They also desired then, and always do, that the comfort of the people might be increased. We see in all the Missions that as soon as the people begin to believe the Bible and the Gospel they become better and more true and steady, and also more prosperous, even in the things of this world. We do not want people only to come and say they are going to do so and so, but we want people who from their hearts really wish to serve God. We get nothing by our Mission work, except that we think we are doing God’s work, and if people trust us with a million dollars, it shows that they believe at least that we are honest. It does not prove that we are honest, but at least it proves they *think* we are honest. When they know from year to year what we do with the money, they have some means of judging whether we are honest or not. I think you will now understand the arrangements of the Society and its work.

One thing the Committee feel strongly, that they cannot make everybody think alike. God has not made all men’s faces the same. There will be differences both in faces and in opinions. It is right for each to think what he believes to be true. He is responsible to God for what he thinks and for using all means, such as the Word of God and prayer, to learn what His will is. No man has a right to say to another, “You must think so and so.” God’s Word says, “To his own Master he standeth or falleth,” that is, to God. But for the regulation of human affairs there must be some to govern, and to govern with reference to what is good, with the Word of God for their guide. Some

are foolish enough to think it would be nice if all were allowed to do just as they like. But people of experience and wisdom know that God has directed that there should be government, without it there would be no safety for life or property, therefore every body of people have to decide, under proper guidance, for themselves what are the best arrangements for the good of the whole body. It is always found that some rules are necessary; to make them too many or too tight is not good. Those nations prosper most that most respect the Word of God, and carry out in its spirit the government of the country and of communities, that is, of bodies of people living together in one place.

The Committee were very sorry that troubles arose at Metlakatla, and wish, as far as they properly can, to remove them. But they do not wish to do this by trying to get all their own will, but to secure what is really best for this community of Metlakatla. Every one in Metlakatla has the right to decide what he wishes for himself, but each cannot be sure that he will get exactly what he wishes. If there is to be any peace, it must be by some general understanding and arrangement. The Committee wish to promote some arrangement on which there can be peace on proper grounds. If the grounds of peace are not good, the peace will not last long, it is like getting a thin skin over a deep sore. The skin soon breaks, and the sore breaks out again. What is wanted is to get the sore out, and heal that. That is the desire of the Church Missionary Society with regard to these troubles. I may notice that the word *Church* in the name of the Society means the Church of England. The Committee of the Church Missionary Society approves of the Church of England as we understand it. There are some in the Church of England who think differently from us, and want to have it what is called "High Church." We are called "Low Church." The other Society, S.P.G., which is a smaller Society, is favoured by the High Church party. The Church Missionary Society is entrusted with more money than any other Society in England. I mention this only to show the confidence we get from the people. We may be all wrong, but you can judge for yourselves whether we are *likely* to be all wrong. We do not want people to come and tell us what they are. If they do, we always keep it in our own power to judge what a man is. And so I expect others not to take what I say without consideration, but to judge for themselves whether it is right.

It will not be of much use to go into the causes of these troubles now. It would be a long business. We are ready to do it. We have come to place our time at the disposal of the Christians at Metlakatla. We ought to give you time to think over what we say, and not ask you to be in a hurry to say what you think. We are ready to answer any question anybody may ask. We do not say that we are able to answer every question; but our object is to give full information on anything in which any one is interested, if we can give it, and if we think it right to give it. We want you to be quite free in asking questions. We shall be quite free in telling you everything we can tell you, and ought to tell you. We tell you our only object in coming. We, agreeing with the Committee, placed ourselves at the

service of the Committee, hoping to do real good to the friends at Metlakatla. We have no power from Government. The Committee could not give us any power to decide anything as a judge decides. But we can hear what everybody has to say, and can judge how far it is right or wrong. Then we can tell the Committee what has been said, and what we think about it. We have not come to take a side—to favour one and disfavour another; but we have come to be as just as we can in forming our opinions, and to get the truth, whether any one likes it or does not—we cannot be guided by that. We are only men, and may make mistakes, but we desire not to make any. I need not say more as to our spirit in coming among you.

For myself, I have been thirty-seven years in India, and there as a servant of the Government I had to judge about many different things. All I can do is to use the experience thus gained to judge in this matter also.

The causes of these troubles are of some importance, and we should truly ascertain what these are. But it is much more important that we should be able to advise what is best for the present and the future, and the friends here present and others can assist us in this if they think it right to do so. The Committee desire true and full information. We cannot of course take what every person says, and assume that it is all true. We must shake what we are told in a sieve, and see what truth remains, and then tell the Committee what we have ascertained.

I think I have said enough, because Mr. Blackett has yet to speak. [At this point there was some discussion about going on. Ultimately General Touch was requested by those present to finish now all he had to say.]

The Committee have received different reports about these matters. Those who were bound to write have written and told the Committee what they think; and Mr. Duncan's friends have written and told them what *they* think. But the Committee are 7000 miles away. Any one who wants to decide justly desires to judge for himself. The Committee cannot all come out here; if they could, they would like to do so; but we have given up some months to do this for them. So we want to do our best to promote the Committee's object.

As to the causes of the troubles, I do not think it is possible now to get full information on that. It would take a long time to do it well. We do not want to go back and say we have done our best, but have not done the best that could be done. We are willing to give any amount of time to get at the truth. We know that the friends here cannot give much time; they must go and do their work, and look after their own interests. While you are here, we want you to give us the time that is most convenient to you. We want you to think over what we say to you, and consider what is best. We want you to judge for yourselves. Every man has a right to decide, in the sight of God, in his own way.

To the time of what I will call "the split," you were all Christians of the Church Missionary Society—Mr. Duncan as a missionary of the Society, you as the sons and daughters of the Society. But you have

a right to say, "Now we want to be under a different Church government." God's Word does not tell all to think alike; but it does tell us that in some things, if we do not think according to the Word, we think wrong. But in many things of less importance different people may think differently, and have different arrangements. All people acknowledge this. I never was in any part of the world where it was not acknowledged. It must not be supposed that we want to use pressure or force; we only want to set before you what is best, or, at least, what we think best, and then leave you to decide for yourselves.

As I said, up to the time of "the split," you were the sons of the Church Missionary Society. We quite understand that, to you, Mr. Duncan was the Church Missionary Society. We were very sorry that we and Mr. Duncan could not think alike on some points which we thought important. Any missionary has a right at any time to say, "When I entered the service of the Society I thought so and so, and so understood things; but now I think differently, and therefore cannot continue to be a missionary of the Society." We should be sorry that that happened, but should feel it unjust not to allow any man to act as he believed in the sight of God to be right. Some *have said* so, and left us. We do not quarrel with them when they do so; rather, we say to them, "We honour you for acting as you believe to be right." "We do not agree with you." Yet we say, "We sent you out, and we will pay your expenses in coming back, so as to leave you where we found you." If they wish that, it is done—if they do not wish to come back—we are ready to give them help to begin a new course of life in their own way. If they do not want such help, we do not give it. We are only anxious to deal justly; if we did not, people would not trust us.

It so happens that Mr. Duncan wrote to the Society to the effect: "I cannot do what the Church Missionary Society thinks right, because I think otherwise." We invited Mr. Duncan to talk with us before we left England. He came to the Church Missionary House, and for five and a half hours he spoke to us, and told us what he thought fully. In some things we agreed with him; in other things we could not agree with him. We told him where we did not agree with him, and we asked him to be here when we were here. He was doubtful whether he could or not, but he said he would try, and would let us know. We did not hear from him before he left; but in Victoria we received a telegram, stating that he had left on the 8th. This was sent by the Society for the information of Mr. Blackett and myself, so I hope he will soon be here. If Mr. Duncan is here, it will help us to get what we want, because Mr. Duncan is a principal party in the matter; and we cannot get at the whole truth unless the principal party is here. We may get as much of it as we can before he comes, and we have to use our time as best we may. We cannot tell when he may be here. We have not heard his plans. Perhaps he may come by the next steamer; if he does, it will be very helpful; we shall see what happens; so we shall go on with our business. We will hear as much as we can; then, when Mr. Duncan comes, we shall have the benefit of his presence and his help.

We always regret when any division takes place among the Christians

in a small place : that is not good. There is only one thing worse, and that is, for the sake of peace to do wrong. We do desire peace, and we hope we can do right and have peace.

That remains to be seen. I would ask all to pray to God that He would lead all to seek for peace, and guide all to do what is best for His glory, and for the good of the Christians in Metlakatla. All men like to have their own will. I do, but I do not always get it, and I think it is a good thing that I do not. But we must desire something above our own will ; that God may guide us, and bend our wills as may be best for His children. Since we knew we had this work to do, I can safely say that it has been our daily prayer that God will do what we cannot do—that is, that He will influence us all to do what He would like us to do. I ask all present, if they think this right, to pray for this from God. Does any one here know what is the ninth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew ? “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.” It is not blessed are they who quarrel and fight. The Bible does not say let wrong continue rather than contend. St Paul says we must contend for what is right as concerns God. But there is a great difference between contending for God and contending for our own wills ; and we have to keep that before us. Let us ask God to enable us to do the one and not to do the other. I think now I had better conclude for this evening, for my colleague, Mr. Blackett, has yet to speak. To make sure that we remember what we have said, he has noted what I have said, and I shall note what he says. We want to make all correct in writing, so that we may be able to say to the Committee, “This is what was said, judge of it.” When I have spoken to you I had not written down beforehand what I have spoken. I did not know exactly what I would say. Only after we were told to-day we were to meet you this evening, I put down some points on which I wished to speak ; but the words I have spoken have been those which came up at the moment. Of these words we shall keep a copy, so that there may be no question whether we said so and so or did not.

Perhaps you will find it difficult to remember all I have said, and all Mr. Blackett will say ; but you will have a general idea what it is you have to think of. We shall be ready to meet you again whenever you like, and after Mr. Blackett has spoken, we shall be ready to answer any questions. If any one likes to ask any questions now here, we will try to answer them ; if not, at any other time, or at our own house. And do not be afraid to ask questions. What we want is to clear away all doubts out of your hearts and minds.

I will now sit down.

Council Room, Metlakatla, April 22nd, 1886.

MR. BLACKETT said :—I shall not keep you long. Now you have been told of the Church Missionary Society. I heard in India a story of a great giant who had no head, but had such long arms that he could embrace any one who came within a mile of him. The Church Missionary Society has a head and such long arms that it can embrace

people on this side of the world, and on the other side of the world too. The Church Missionary Society embraces you, not as though it claimed or desired to exercise any power whatever over you, but it feels the deepest interest in you, and desires that you should be saved eternally, and that God should be glorified in you.

The proof that the Church Missionary Society cares for you and loves you is that they have sent out first Mr. Duncan, and then others, to preach the Gospel and to do you good. It was therefore grieved when troubles came among you. It was very much grieved when you were separated from the Society. It could not help, even after the separation, caring for you. If a child leaves its father's house, and will not live as one of his family, the father grieves over that child, and the proof that the Society still cares for you is that it has sent out us to talk to you.

The particular instruction we have is to hear everything everybody has to say. We want to hear all you have to say, whether you say it together or separately. We cannot promise to agree with you in all you say, but our business is to hear you in everything you wish to say: tell us everything you think we ought to know.

The great thing the Committee desire is that all should live in peace. You know many texts of Scripture. One is, "As much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men." That is God's command. Mark, "With all men." It does not say live peaceably with those who agree with you in everything. If two people want to go to the same place, there will not be much difference in the direction they will go. We all want to go to heaven; and if this is our desire there will not be much disputing as to the exact way we walk in. A man may go a little to the right or to the left of the road I go in, but I shall not quarrel with him on that account, nor he with me. When we do live peaceably with all men, we find that we don't differ so much as we think. Another man and I can go to heaven, even if we don't walk side by side.

We ought to follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and He loved all men, even if He did not agree with them. We desire peace, but the foundation must be love, and there is no true Christianity where there is not love. Love calls out love in others. Therefore, let us ask God to give us all love, so that when we discuss these matters we may do so in love, and if we have love in our hearts we shall find a way to live peaceably with all men. We want you to tell us everything you think you ought to tell us. Pray to God, and let us look up to Him for help, and we shall find a way to put an end to all these troubles.

APPENDIX B.

LETTER OF DAVID LEASK, FOR THE INDIANS ATTACHED TO MR. DUNCAN, IN REPLY TO THE ADDRESSES DELIVERED BY THE DEPUTATION ON THE EVENING OF 22ND APRIL, 1886.

Metlakahtla, British Columbia,
April 27th, 1886.

DEAR SIRS,—We the people of Metlakahtla in meeting assembled have heard your speeches, which you kindly wrote out at our request, translated to us, and, after hearing them, we have decided not to give any answer for the following reasons :—

1. You say you have no authority from the Society to settle anything, but only to make inquiry and hear opinions.

2. We do not think anything would be gained by going over everything, when we have already told the Society in our letters what our troubles are.

3. We have not asked the Society to send you. We did ask them when our troubles first began, to send a deputation to inquire into matters, but they refused.

4. Two of our number went with Mr. Duncan as delegates to Ottawa last spring, and had an interview with Sir John Macdonald, when they presented our letter. He promised to consider the whole matter and send us an answer. We have not yet received this letter, and it would hardly be fair to make any settlement without awaiting his reply.

But while we do not see reason to enter into any discussions, or waste our time in fruitless talkings, we wish to bring before you in a few words the real state of the case, which you have not so much as referred to in your speeches, and to ask the Society two questions.

Metlakahtla, including the two acres, was Tsimshean land, and the site of an old village, before ever Mr. Duncan left England. The first Tsimsheans who wished to serve God showed this place to Mr. Duncan as a good site for a Christian village. There never was the smallest idea of taking it or any part of it from them. We were willing and glad for the missionaries of the Society to occupy the two acres as long as we felt they were working for us; but we never supposed the Society would try to take these two acres from us, and claim them because they had their buildings on them, any more than we supposed Mr. Duncan would want to take from us the pieces of land on which he erected the sawmill and other works. We were no parties to the arrangement between the Government and the Society about the two acres.

We feel that the Society is not working for us any longer, but is opposing and hindering us, and we wish them to move off our land.

We ask the Society this question. Will the Society, in consideration of our prior claim to the land and our earnest request, give up their claim and yield to this our unanimous wish?

The reason for the first Christians leaving Fort Simpson and coming to Metlakahtla, was to form a Christian community of members from any of the many surrounding tribes. Those who came were to give

up t
and
time
sett
and
live
Be
some
Engl
we d
woul
W
us.
to lea
had s
not t
are
to do
W
hear
cont
amon
their
retur
bless
To
Fr
CORP
DE
In it
day e
give
wish
1.
thing
Th
ascert

up their tribal and other distinctions, and live as one people united and binding themselves each one to follow the rules laid down from time to time by their council. So that unity was the basis of the settlement. The coming of each was voluntary. His stay was voluntary, and he could leave if ever he found the rules irksome. We wished to live as brethren united in all things.

Before the separation, the Society told us they wished to make some changes, and bring us into direct connection with the Church of England. We did not want these changes, and when the Society found we did not want to change, they dismissed Mr. Duncan, because he would not try to make us do what they wanted.

We all, without any exception, asked Mr. Duncan to stay here among us. After some months a few separated from us. They had a right to leave us if they chose, but not to remain at Metlakahtla after they had separated from us, because they had promised to be with us. It is not that these few have left us that causes the trouble, but that they are being supported by the Society in doing what they ought not to do.

What we wish to ask the Society is this, Will the Society refuse to hear our earnest entreaty, and in opposition to our unanimous wish continue to support the direct cause of the dissension and disunion among us, or will they not rather listen to our prayer and withdraw their support and thus put an end to the trouble, and enable us to return to the old paths and again enjoy that union which was such a blessing to us and those around us?

To Major-General J. G. Touch,
Rev. W. R. Blackett,
C.M.S. Deputies.

From the people of Metlakahtla, and signed for them by
D. LEASK, Secretary.

APPENDIX C.

COPY OF LETTER TO DAVID LEASK FOR THE CHRISTIAN INDIANS AT
METLAKATLA ATTACHED TO MR. DUNCAN.

Metlakatla, British Columbia,
April 30th, 1886.

DEAR FRIENDS,—We have received your letter of April 27th, 1886. In it you tell us that after having heard what we said to you on Thursday evening, April 22nd, translated to you, you had decided not to give any answer. For this you give four reasons. These reasons we wish to notice in order :—

1. 'Because we have no authority from the Society to settle anything, but only to make inquiry and hear opinions.'

The word "opinions" is not quite correct. Our object is rather to ascertain *facts*, to obtain reliable information. It is our duty to use

every means to separate what is fact from what is only opinion. We want *evidence*.

The power to *settle* its own affairs lies with the Committee of the Society. But observe this, that while we have no power to settle anything, neither do we ask *you* now to settle anything. We are instructed to *confer* with you. This is shown by the resolution read to you on Thursday. We know that the Committee hopes that after conference with you we may be able to come to an understanding with you as to what should be done. And this might enable them to decide on their course of action, in order to secure peace, either now or hereafter, at Metlakatla. This is what all should desire.

2: You say that you 'do not think anything would be gained by going over everything, when you have already told the Society in your letters what your troubles are.'

The Society know something from your letters as to what your troubles are. But conference face to face is the best way of obtaining full information. And for the purpose of obtaining full information we have been sent out.

3. You say that you 'have not asked the Society to send us out.'

We had a long talk with Mr. Duncan in London. He then expressed his satisfaction at our being sent out to see you, and assured us that you would receive us gladly. You did receive us on our arrival with marked cordiality and kindness. This we heartily acknowledge with our best thanks. At the meeting on Thursday, the 22nd, we gave you an explanation of our mission. And we said what seemed necessary to introduce the discussion of details at future meetings. Afterwards we invited you to ask any questions you desired, either then or afterwards. You thanked us, and asked for a copy of what we had said, so that you might consider it deliberately, and afterwards ask questions if you wished. We promised you a copy the next evening, and through John Tait you thanked us for complying with your request.

On Friday evening about half-past six, we delivered the promised copy to John Tait.

Nothing passed between us afterwards till we received your reply. It seems hardly to agree with what you have done already, or with the courtesy you have shown us hitherto, if you tell us now you will give us no answer because you had not asked the Society to send us.

4. You tell us that two of you, with Mr. Duncan, had an interview with Sir John Macdonald last spring, and that he then promised to consider the whole matter submitted to him in your letter. You think that it would hardly be fair to make any settlement until you receive his reply.

We quite admit that in any understanding we may come to, it might be proper to reserve any points referred to Sir John Macdonald. But we do not ask you to come to any immediate settlement. And you have already observed that we have no power to settle anything ourselves. We wish only to prepare the way for a settlement hereafter.

We

of furt
After

before
'the t
village
suppos
the gro
were n
Society

We

two ad
John I

that w
were i

busine
Deput

Victor

request
be ena

to us d
at our
upon t

words

Firs
wrote

Musgr
of Sta
dated

Mr.

"T
and in

where

such p
amply

Reser
benefit

"B
any p
but on

The

Dunca
Reserv

follow

"S

We do not therefore feel that these reasons need stand in the way of further conference.

After giving these reasons for giving no answer, you go on to bring before us your view of the real state of the case. 1. You tell us that 'the two acres were Tsimshean land, and part of the site of an old village, before Mr. Duncan left England.' You say that you never supposed the Society would try to take those two acres from you on the ground that they had their buildings on them. You state that you were no parties to the arrangement between the Government and the Society about the two acres.

We knew how much importance you attached to the question of the two acres. The Secretaries of the Society, therefore, wrote to Sir John Macdonald, and to the Government at Victoria, and told them that we were coming out to inquire into all these matters. When we were in Ottawa, Sir John Macdonald was too ill to see any one on business. We dare say you know this. But he had directed his Deputy to write letters to the agent of the Dominion Government at Victoria, and to the Indian Superintendent. In these letters he requested them to give us all assistance and information, so that we might be enabled to do what we were sent out for. These letters were given to us open, and we brought them to Victoria. Among the papers placed at our disposal by the officials at Victoria, we find several which bear upon the question of the two acres. We will quote here the actual words of some important decisions.

First we quote from a memorandum of the Hon. Mr. Trutch. He wrote it when he was Commissioner of Lands and Works. Governor Musgrave forwarded it with his approval to Earl Granville, Secretary of State for the Colonies in England. The letter forwarding it was dated "Government House, British Columbia, 29th January, 1870."

Mr. Trutch's words are these :—

"The Indians have in fact been held to be special wards of the Crown, and in the exercise of this guardianship, Government has in all cases where it has been desirable for the interests of the Indians, set apart such portions of the Crown lands as were deemed proportionate to, and amply sufficient for, the requirements of each tribe. And these Indian Reserves are held by Government in trust for the exclusive use and benefit of the Indians resident thereon.

"But the title of the Indians in the fee of the public lands, or of any portion thereof, has never been acknowledged by Government, but on the contrary is distinctly denied.

"(Signed) JOSEPH W. TRUTCH."

The next record we quote is a letter of the Government to Mr. Duncan. It is a reply to his application for the extension of the Reserve at Metlakatla, and for the grant of the two acres. It is as follows :—

"Colonial Secretary's Office,
"27th September, 1864.

"SIR,—I have the honour to acquaint you, with reference to your

letter of the 30th May last, that the Government Reserve at Metlakatla has been, by direction of the Governor, extended to a distance of five miles on each side of the Mission Point, and five miles back from the coast-line

"His Excellency has also directed that the two acres of land known as Mission Point is to be held in trust by the Government for the benefit of the Church Missionary Society.

"I have, &c.,
CHARLES GOOD.

"For the Colonial Secretary.

"W. Duncan, Esq.,
"Metlakatla."

Both at Ottawa and at Victoria we ascertained from the Government officials that the state of the law is still as shown in these papers. We quote one more extract. It is from a report of P. O'Reilly, Esq., Indian Reserves Commissioner to the Right Honourable the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs at Ottawa.

It is dated, you will observe, after your separation from the Society.

"Victoria, British Columbia,
"8th April, 1882.

"Ten miles along the coast by five miles back of this tract, which includes the village, fisheries, &c. of Metlakatla, was in 1863 declared to be a Government Reserve, no doubt intended for the Indians, though not specially so stated, and two acres within the village site of Metlakatla was specially reserved for the Church Missionary Society.

"(Signed) P. O'REILLY.
"Indian Reserve Commissioner."

You profess to live according to the Queen's laws. Indeed you are bound to do so. Now the Queen's laws secure the right of the Church Missionary Society to this land as these extracts clearly show. The Queen's Government, which holds these two acres in trust for the Society, has declared the Society's right by having them surveyed. You will therefore see that you are bound to respect that right.

You are, then, wrong in supposing that the Society has tried to take these two acres from you. It was quite needless to do so, as the Society holds the two acres in just the same way as you hold the Reserve. That is, the Government hold both in trust, the Reserve for you, and the two acres for the Society.

II. You say that the Society is not any longer working for you, but is opposing and hindering you. And you wish them to move off the land.

You have separated yourselves from the Society. You have, of course, a perfect right to do so if you choose. But the Society does all it can for your benefit, and will go on working for your benefit still. It does not hold Mission Point only for the benefit of those who adhere to it.

It is
Point
first
it no
which
you
the
Chri
othe
estab
do n
you.
with
F
are
do n
man
have
amo
II
your
clair
W
ques
to g
that
plai
clair
Dun
they
thro
Soci
requ
IV
Met
peop
Frou
chos
the
Mr.
Miss
as h
as a
obje
prin
whic
is g
unit
Wor
proc

It is bound to do all it can for them. But it is bound to hold Mission Point, and does hold it, for your highest benefit also. It held it at first that the Word of God might be introduced among you. It holds it now in order to offer you the full benefit of the religion of Christ which has so happily begun to take root amongst you. For instance you have been deprived hitherto of the Lord's Supper. This is one of the greatest privileges of the Christian religion, and every true Christian has a right to it. While your Christianity is in this and other respects imperfect, the Society cannot feel that its work of establishing the Gospel among you has been completed. Many of you do not at present care to accept the ministrations the Society offers to you. But that does not set free the Society from the duty of putting within your reach an un mutilated Christianity.

Further, the Society cannot lose sight of this,—that at present you are not, as far as they know, supported by any Society. Thus they do not see any guarantee that the present state of things will be permanent among you. They feel, therefore, that they may at any time have to take up again that responsibility for the support of the Gospel among you which they bore for so many years.

III. You ask this question, Will the Society, in consideration of your prior claim to the land and your earnest request, give up their claim to the land ?

We must not deceive you by giving you any doubtful reply to this question. We answer that we cannot in any way advise the Committee to give up their Metlakatla Mission, nor do we, for a moment, believe that under any circumstances they will do so. We have already explained to you that you are wrong in supposing that you have any claim to Mission Point. The Committee have already informed Mr. Duncan through Mr. Wigram, the Honorary Secretary, that they feel they have duties to fulfil both towards the Native Church built up through the agents of this Society, and towards the members of the Society at home. We cannot therefore hold out any hope that your request will be complied with.

IV. You tell us of the circumstances under which the Mission at Metlakatla was established. You say that the wish was to form one people, united by certain conditions, to which they voluntarily agreed. From these, you say, they could be freed by leaving the place if they chose. As to these conditions, we must remind you of this,—that the Mission was the Mission of the Church Missionary Society,—that Mr. Duncan was their agent; and that he was bound to conduct the Mission according to the instructions and rules of the Society, so long as he remained in its service. The Society do not object to such rules as are necessary for the proper conducting of a Mission, but they do object to conditions being imposed which are not consistent with the principles of God's Word, which even the law of the land rejects, and which considerations of what is called "general policy"—that is, of what is good for all the people—declare to be bad. For uniformity is not unity, and enforced uniformity in matters in which neither God's Word nor wise men require all men to think and act exactly alike, can produce only insincerity and discord. The principle adopted among

you is that religious unity is necessary to civil unity. This the Society cannot sanction, nor give way to. It is contrary to the spirit of God's Word. And you know that the result of your attempting to apply it has been condemned by the Government Commission which held an inquiry here in November, 1884. The law of the land condemns these conditions. That people have voluntarily agreed to them does not make it lawful to enforce penalties or to drive people away from their homes for the conscientious breach of them.

V. You remark that before the separation the Society told you they wished to make some changes and to bring you into direct connection with the Church of England. This is a mistake on your part. The Society is a Church of England Society. It sent out Mr. Duncan as a member of the Church of England. It always required him to teach you and conduct the services in the Mission according to the general principles of the Church of England, which it believes to be Scriptural. For the Church of England solemnly disclaims all authority in matters of faith save that of the Word of God. Thus there was no change on the Society's part. But the Committee found that in some things Mr. Duncan did not recognize or obey the principles of the Church of England as they understand them. Specially he told them himself that none of you had been admitted to partake of the Lord's Supper. Yet some of you, he told them, had been true Christians for many years. Now our Saviour commands His people to partake of the Lord's Supper. You may see the command in 1 Corinthians ii. 24, and in other places. He says plainly, "This do in remembrance of Me." The Committee had a very great respect for Mr. Duncan. But they felt that they could not allow him to stand in the way of your obeying this command of the Lord. Nor could they permit him to forbid your receiving this, which is the privilege and right of every faithful Christian. Thus they were compelled most reluctantly to disconnect him from their service, in order to secure for you your full rights as Christians.

VI. On one point it appears from your letter that you do not fully understand the facts. Mr. Duncan was paid a salary by the Society, year by year from 1857, when he came out to you at Fort Simpson, to 1881, when his connection with the Society was severed. The Society also sent out money, besides this, for the expenses of the Mission. According to the rules and to the actual practice of the Society, all money given for the Society's Missions belongs to the Society, not to the missionaries. All such money is subject to the control of the Committee. It makes no difference whether the money is paid into the Society's treasury in London, or given to its agents for special purposes, or to any missionary by friends at home or abroad for any branch of the work carried on by the missionaries. This we can both of us state from our personal knowledge. One of us has learnt it as a member of the Committee at home and abroad for many years, and the other as an agent of the Society, and as an acting-secretary for a time.

Mr. Duncan collected money from friends of the Society, and, as he tells us, from others also. But as our agent he collected that money

for our M
have bee
any othe

"Eve
Missions
and accu
that may
accounts
Mission,

Mr. D
him for
purposes
not ther
works ca
since the
benefit.
their exp
mittee v
that loss

A mis
agreeme
gives his
perty of
the Hon
dollars f
at once
ceases to

VII.
means o
in doing
all. W
have he
say as v
best evi
be admi
support
of the c

VIII
been pr
have do
shortly
him wit
which h
have to

IX. I
question
You ha
govern
law of t
run to

for our Mission. If he had not been our agent the money would not have been given for our Mission, and he had no authority to collect for any other. The following is one of the Society's rules:—

“Every individual connected with the Society in its different Missions, in whatsoever department of labour, shall keep a detailed and accurate account of the funds placed at his disposal in the form that may be pointed out to him; and shall regularly transmit such accounts to the Parent Committee or to their representatives at the Mission, at such periods as may be specified for that purpose.”

Mr. Duncan, then, ought to have accounted for all money received by him for this Mission, whether for church, school, sawmill, or other purposes. (The cannery was established after the severance, and does not therefore come under the rule.) Part of the expenses of the other works came from trade profits; but these profits belonged to the Society, since the industries were part of the Society's mission-work for your benefit. Mr. Duncan's good management made them more than pay their expenses. If there had been loss on the whole work the Committee would have acknowledged their responsibility for making up that loss.

A missionary's whole time belongs to the Society, according to the agreement between him and the Society. And even if a missionary gives his own money to help the Mission, it becomes thereon the property of the Society, and not that of the giver. For instance, Mr. Wigram, the Honorary Secretary of the Society, has recently given fifty thousand dollars for a particular purpose in connection with the Society. This at once becomes the property of the Society for that purpose, and ceases to be Mr. Wigram's own money.

VII. We were sent out to confer with you that we might have every means of ascertaining the truth, and we rely on you to give us your help in doing so. We desire to conduct our inquiry in a spirit friendly to all. We are bound to get the best evidence as to facts we can. We have heard some things, but we should like to hear what you have to say as well as others. It is a principle of law and justice that if the best evidence is withheld by any party, less satisfactory evidence may be admitted. And it will remain then for those who give money to support the work to form their own conclusions as to the actual state of the case.

VIII. We should have much desired that Mr. Duncan should have been present when we met, and spoke with you. You know that we have done our best to secure his presence. As he is expected here shortly he will see what we have said. And we shall be ready to meet him with you, and discuss with him any matters referred to here by us which he may desire to bring forward. If he does not arrive before we have to leave, we shall be very sorry.

IX. In conclusion, we would ask you to consider carefully one question. We all want peace, true, scriptural, and permanent peace. You have learnt by experience that some of your regulations for the government of your community have brought you into conflict with the law of the land. You must see that it will be impossible in the long run to carry out such regulations. The longer the contest continues

the more clearly will you learn this. If you examine the Word of God you will find that it lends no countenance to the attempt to over-ride by rules the consciences of your fellow-Christians.

We would therefore ask you, solemnly, and most kindly, whether you will not cease to impose or attempt to enforce such regulations as your brethren and fellow-Christians cannot conform to without doing violence to their consciences? Nothing more than this, we believe, is required to restore peace and harmony at Metlakatla.

(Signed) J. G. TOUCH.
" W. R. BLACKETT.

April 30th, 1886.

To Mr. David Leask, for the Indians of Metlakatla attached to Mr. Duncan.

APPENDIX D.

COPY OF LETTER TO DAVID LEASK FOR INDIANS, DISAVOWING ANY INTENTION OF IMPUTING UNWORTHY MOTIVES IN OUR LETTER OF THE 30TH APRIL, 1886, READ AT THE MEETING ON THAT DATE.

Metlakatla, May 3rd, 1886.

DEAR FRIENDS,—Mr. Tomlinson tells us that he understands a part of our letter read to you last Friday as implying a charge of fraud against Mr. Duncan.

This is entirely a mistake, and we trust none of you will be misled by it. The terms of the letter imply no such charge, and we do not think that reasonable men would so interpret them.

We quoted certain rules and practices of the Society concerning accounts with its agents. These are facts within our own knowledge. It is quite possible that Mr. Duncan may not have been acquainted with them. Perhaps he was not even asked for any accounts. This we do not know. But we do know that the rules exist. We quoted them only to show, as we stated, that the Mission, with all connected with it, was the Mission of the Church Missionary Society.

We have no suspicion whatever that Mr. Duncan misused or in any way misapplied the funds entrusted to his care. On the contrary, we believe he used them strictly and wisely for your benefit, and in a manner probably which the Society would heartily approve. But this does not alter the fact that those funds came to him as an agent of the Church Missionary Society. On this subject we felt that we had to remove a misapprehension from your minds.

However, these are all matters relating to the past, and have not much bearing upon the question for the present. That question is simply this, Whether you will for the future, in accordance with the Word of God, "live peaceably with all men," specially with your brethren who do not in all things agree with you.

(Signed) J. G. TOUCH.
" W. R. BLACKETT.

To Mr. David Leask, for the Christian Indians at Metlakatla attached to Mr. Duncan.

APPENDIX E.

COPY OF NOTE TO MR. TOMLINSON, INFORMING HIM OF OUR LETTER
TO DAVID LEASK OF THE SAME DATE.

Metlakatla, 3rd May, 1886.

DEAR MR. TOMLINSON.—Adverting to what you said at the meeting, on Friday evening, and to what passed at our interview yesterday, we have written to David Leask, as the representative of the Indians, disavowing any intention of imputing unworthy motives to Mr. Duncan, and assuring them that we have no suspicion of anything of the kind. We are quite willing to be judged by the actual tenor of our letter, but as you informed us that they did look upon the letter as reflecting on his character, we thought it well to adopt this obvious means of removing, if possible, the misapprehension.

We are, yours very truly,

(Signed)

J. G. TOUCH.

W. R. BLACKETT.

”

The Rev. R. Tomlinson,
Metlakatla.

APPENDIX F.

LETTER OF DAVID LEASK FOR THE PEOPLE OF METLAKATLA.

Metlakatla, British Columbia,

May 4th 1886.

DEAR SIRS,—In your first interview with us, you would have misled us into the belief that you had come from the Society seeking reliable information to enable them to decide upon a course of action. Your second communication shows us that this was not the intention of the Society, for they had already made up their minds as to how they would act in the only two matters which really concerned us and them and stood in the way of peace being restored, so that any discussion of matters in conference would have been so much time wasted.

You tell us the Society will not give up the two acres, and you refer us to some “decisions,” as you are pleased to call them, but what are in reality only the opinions of individual Government officers, and then boldly assert we can have no claim on these two acres. The God of Heaven who created man upon the earth, gave this land to our forefathers, some of whom once lived on this very two acres, and we have received the land by direct succession from them. No man-made law can justly take from us the gift of Him who is the source of all true law and justice. Relying on this, the highest of all titles, we claim our land, and notify the Society through you its deputies to move off the two acres.

But you tell us it is not only to maintain the Society’s claim to the two acres that they refuse to leave Metlakatla. They wish to continue the division among us. The Society, you tell us, cannot sanction the principles adopted by us that religious unity is necessary to civil unity,

and even dares to tell us that this principle is contrary to God's Word. How you can reconcile this last assertion with the history of God's people of old as recorded in God's Word, and with other portions of the blessed Scripture, we are at a loss to imagine. You stand forth as the champion of disunion, civil and religious.

Ever since the disruption, *we* have been credited with being the cause of the existence and continuance of the dissension among us. Now, at last, the truth has come to light, and it is clear to all men that to the Society, and the Society alone, belongs this proud distinction. For by leaving Metlakahtla, the Society can at once and completely put an end to the dissension.

For unity we came here; for unity we remained here, and for unity we are prepared to contend to the last. God inclined our hearts while we were still in the midst of the strifes and divisions at our old heathen villages to accept this principle. God has blessed us acting on this principle, and God will help and defend us contending for this principle.

You say we have separated from the Society. We never by any promise or agreement joined the Society. It is quite true the Society sent out and supported our teachers—we remember this, and feel grateful to them for it; but this does not bring us into connection with the Society. The money was not the Society's, but the contribution of Christians to God, to aid in the spread of His Gospel. Does the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which is also supported by contribution, claim any right over or connection with those animals which by the help of their paid agents they have rescued from torture? If not, why should the Church Missionary Society claim any such right in, or connection with its converts? Again, you speak to us as if we had left the Church of England. We were not asked to join the Church of England when we came to Metlakahtla, nor when we came forward for baptism, though we were visited at various times by ministers of that Church, who baptized many of us, yet none of these asked us to join the Church of England.

The first time we were asked to join the Church of England was when the Society decided that the Lord's Supper must be introduced among us with the ceremonial of the Church of England. At once we objected to join the Church of England or any other denomination, preferring to be an independent Native Church, with power to regulate our ceremonial in accordance with God's Word, and as best suited our needs.

Our statement in our former letter, that the Society proposed to make changes and bring us into direct connection with the Church of England, and that it was the attempt to force this upon us which caused the disruption, is simply in accordance with the facts, and your attempt to explain it away only shows how ignorant you are of these facts and the position assumed by the Society in the matter.

You say we have been deprived of the Lord's Supper. It is not so. No one has ever done this. The way the Society and its agents have been and are acting, has made us hesitate to adopt the rite, not from forgetfulness of our blessed Lord's command, but because through love

and respect for Him we would not let this His precious gift be mixed up in the controversy. When our God in His own good time has restored us to unity and peace, we can consider the subject and introduce the rite among us in the way most nearly according with what is written.

Again, you tell us that because we are not in connection with any other Society, you see no guarantee that the present state of things will be permanent. We see the highest guarantee in such beautiful promises as that which was a source of such comfort to St. Paul, when he says, "My God shall supply *all* your need," and while we recognize the truth that God often uses human means, we have the highest warranty of Scripture that He is not only *not* dependent on them, but sometimes even refuses to use them.

Your reflection on Mr. Duncan's conduct while in connection with the Society, excited in us a feeling of painful surprise that two Christians, sent out by a Christian Society, could come out all the way from England, and in his absence try to damage the character of one whose services God has so signally acknowledged. In your letter of yesterday you have, we are happy to say, explained a part of what you originally said, but you still cling to your unfounded assertion that we are indebted to the Society, and not to Mr. Duncan, for the existence of the various industries established among us. We *know* better, and so mere assertion goes for nothing.

You say the Society still cares for us, and is anxious to do all it can for our benefit. How has it shown its interest in us? By bringing ships-of-war and Government officials to overawe us; by dragging us before courts and magistrates; by fining and imprisoning some of us; by upholding and supporting everything they have seen to be objectionable to us, and by refusing to do any one thing we asked for. We do not call this love and care, but persecution.

By distinctly refusing to give up our land or remove from Metlakahtla the Society has taken away the need to further discuss matters, and we wish this letter to close the correspondence.

We believe the time for conferring about or discussing matters has passed, and the time for deciding how best we can obtain the object we have in view has arrived.

From the people of Metlakatla, and signed for them by

DAVID LEASK.

Major-General J. G. Touch,
Rev. W. R. Blakett,
Metlakahtla.

Metlakahtla, British Columbia,

May 4th, 1886.

To the Church Missionary Society, of Salisbury Square, London, England, its deputies, agents, and all others who may have power to act for it.

NOTICE.

We, the people of Metlakahtla, hereby notify you to move off and

leave that part of the village site of Metlakahtla commonly known as Mission Point, as we cannot consent to your occupying this portion of our land to be a continual source of disquiet and annoyance to our village.

Signed for the people of Metlakahtla,
 DANIEL NEASHKUMKEM, X his mark.
 JOHN TAIT,
 ROBERT HEWSON,
 THOMAS NEASHLAHQSH, X his mark.

APPENDIX G.

COPY.—FROM THE REV. R. TOMLINSON.

Metlakahtla, May 4th, 1886.

DEAR SIRs,—I have seen your letter to David Leask explaining the sense in which you wish your words respecting Mr. Duncan's management of the Society's funds to be understood.

As you have adopted this formal manner of contradicting what to the people and myself seemed to be their plain meaning, we gladly accept your interpretation. At the same time I cannot help feeling surprised and grieved that, on a point of so much importance you are so ignorant as not even to know whether the Society asked for any accounts, and that without taking the least pains to enlighten yourselves, you gave utterance in a public meeting to a statement which, had you examined into the matter, you would have known to be unfounded.

Yours sincerely,
 ROBERT TOMLINSON.

Major-General J. G. Touch,
 Rev. W. R. Blackett,
 Metlakahtla.

APPENDIX H.

LETTER FROM THE REV. R. TOMLINSON.

Metlakahtla, May 4th, 1886.

DEAR SIRs,—In the accompanying letter of the Indians, I find the statement "that they had never been asked to join the Church of England." It might well be a question how this could be consistent with the fact that from the first they had been under the instruction of those who were members of the Church of England, and sent out by the Society as such. As one who was for many years a missionary of the Society, and for some eleven of those years the only ordained missionary attached to the Society's North Pacific Mission, I would beg leave to lay before you some quotations from the Society's Annual Letters to the missionaries, from which it will appear that such a

result was not only compatible with consistency on the part of the missionaries, but even in direct harmony with the views of the Society at the time. These quotations are marked A. B. C, and are from the Annual Letters of 1876, 1877, 1878. To these I add an extract from a letter of mine to the Committee, dated Ankihtlast, Aug. 28th, 1882, and written before I left the Society. It is marked D. This extract is but an epitome of the principles which actuated me while in connection with the Society. Nothing was introduced which was in any way contrary to the doctrine and practice of the Church of England, while at the same time we always considered the Native Christians had the right to choose, whenever they might wish to do so, such rules, orders, and ceremonial as was consistent with the Word of God and for their benefit. Of course, it was understood that whenever they did so they would be forming themselves into a Native Church, and must not count upon further help from the Society.

We followed the example of the Apostle Paul,—himself a member of the Jewish Church, and sent out by that Church, but establishing independent Native Churches at the various scenes of his labours.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT TOMLINSON.

Major-General J. G. Touch,
Rev. W. R. Blackett,
Metlakahla.

QUOTATIONS REFERRED TO.

A.—*Annual Letter. Church Missionary House, Sept. 8th, 1876.*

“The time seems to have come when Native Christian independence may be still further extended. . . . We would therefore suggest that missionaries should represent this subject to their Native brethren, especially to the leading laymen amongst them. Let the idea become familiar with them. Let the lay delegates of the Church Councils have it frequently brought before them, and should any circumstances arise indicating the advantage of Church independence, let the Church Committees and District and Federal Church Councils at once take action. A general request from Native Christians in any Mission for an independent Native Church would be irresistible.”

B.—*Annual Letter. Church Missionary House, Oct. 1st, 1877.*

“But while as members of the Church of England, the Committee and the Society generally desire to act in strict obedience to the laws of that Church, as well as in conformity with its spirit, they must protest against the same restrictions being imposed on those Native Christians in various foreign countries whom it has pleased God to bring to the profession of faith in Christ through the Society’s instrumentality.

“What the Committee wish to see in these converts is not submission to the Church of England, but the desire for and ultimately the attachment to an independent Church of their own. The Society’s object is the glory of God in the evangelization of the heathen, and not the aggrandizement of the English Church. At the same time

they regard it as more honourable to the Church of England to be the mother of independent children than to be the mistress of subject communities."

C.—*Annual Letter. Church Missionary House, Oct. 1st, 1878.*

"This independence of European help will necessarily involve independence of coercive European control. Of this we must not be afraid. Our object is not the extension of the English Church. In many fields such an object would be absolutely unattainable. . . . The connection therefore between the Church of England and those Native Christian congregations which have been formed through the labours of the Church Missionary Society's missionaries must be regarded as provisional and temporary. The ultimate relation will resemble, probably, that which is cherished in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States—fraternal or even filial affection—but not the smallest approach to subordination."

D.—*Extract from a letter of Rev. R. Tomlinson to the Committee, dated Ankihilast, Aug. 28th, 1882.*

"My efforts among these poor people from the first have been to teach them the simple Gospel, to lead them to study their Bibles, to encourage and help them to rise out of their physical as well as moral degradation, and to advance their temporal interests. I studiously avoided drawing their attention to church or sectarian divisions or dissensions, and aimed chiefly at uniting them in the closest bonds to fight against heathenism and those temptations which their position exposes them to."

APPENDIX I.

LETTER TO THE REV. R. TOMLINSON.

Metlakatla, 20th May, 1886.

DEAR SIR,—We have deferred a reply to your two letters of the 4th inst. until we had an interview with Mr. Duncan, and now we desire to remove certain misapprehensions which these letters disclose.

1. Referring to that which is a reply to ours of the 3rd inst., we observe that you have misunderstood our statement regarding the application for accounts.

The allegation we made was that the rule of the Society required Mr. Duncan to render accounts of the money he collected for the church, the stores, and the industries, as well as other operations of the Mission, in refutation of statements made before the Government Commission and apparently believed by the Indians.

We were aware that accounts had been furnished in connection with certain operations of the Mission, but on taking over the books of the Society from Dr. Praeger at Victoria, under instructions from Salisbury Square, we found that the twelve leaves of one of the Society's books, which, from the index, we learned contained the account of "the

secular
account
since 18

We v
reudere
fund no
we ma
reudere
reudere
fact all

2. A
the let
misund
Letters

You
encour
and yo
indep
among
self-go
is, of
of the

No
and su
referre
tion of
plate
with a
existin
Societ
in whi

How
the S
choos

The
corres
it adv

Th

LETT

Dr
20th

secular fund," had been cut out, and we were not aware whether that account had been rendered or whether at any time during the years since 1857 it had been called for.

We wrote at Victoria for information, and all the original accounts rendered reached us by the last mail; neither the accounts of the secular fund nor of any of the industries appear to be included. The statement we made was not based on the fact that the accounts were or were not rendered or called for, but on the rule which required they should be rendered, and it was not, therefore, as you suppose unfounded—the fact alleged is unquestionable:

2. Adverting to your other letter of the 4th inst., which accompanied the letter from the Indians of the same date, we observe that you have misunderstood the purport of the extracts from the Annual (circular?) Letters appended to your letter under reply.

You will see by the terms of these extracts that they are designed to encourage the development of independence in the Native Churches, and you have apparently overlooked the very important fact that the independence encouraged is that of the converts gathered out from among the heathen whom the Society desire to see self-supporting and self-governing, and not of the European missionary in their employ, who is, of course, under the same obligations as when he entered the service of the Society, whatever may be the condition of the Native Church.

No Native Church which has to be governed by foreign missionaries and supported, even in part, by external aid, has attained the condition referred to. You will also observe that in referring to the organization of Native Churches in the Society's Missions, the letters contemplate Church Committees, District and Federal Church Councils, &c., with a number of Native pastorates and Native pastors, as at present existing in the more advanced Missions under the Church Missionary Society, and not a Mission in the condition of the Metlakatla Mission, in which there is no ordained Native pastor.

However incipient may be the condition of a body of Native converts, the Society cannot prevent them from leaving the Society if they choose, but such an unusual contingency is not contemplated.

The letter of the Indians expresses a wish that it should close the correspondence, and its tone and tenor, which we greatly regret, render it advisable to comply with that wish.

We are, yours very truly,

(Signed)

J. G. TOUCH.

W. R. BLACKETT.

The Rev. R. Tomlinson, Metlakatla.

APPENDIX J.

LETTER FROM THE REV. R. TOMLINSON, DELIVERED ON BOARD THE
s.s. "B. BOSCOWITZ" ON JUNE 4, 1886.

June 2nd, 1886.

DEAR SIRS,—The ground which you appear to take in yours of the 20th ult. as regards the accounts is that "the rule of the Society

required Mr. Duncan to render accounts of the money he collected for the church, the stores, the industries, as well as other operations of the missionary." You speak of the rule of the Society, but you do not say when it was made or how long it has been in force. If the rule was in force when Metlakahtla was founded, then the whole conduct of the Committee and Secretaries of the Society for over twenty years in approving of these works and industries, and yet never once asking for accounts of expenditure on them while they received and accepted the accounts for all Society's money expended during those years, shows that the rule did not refer to such industries at all. But if the rule you refer to is of later date, then the Committee and Secretaries kept it a profound secret, and now more than three years after Mr. Duncan has left the Society, it is brought to light for the first time. It seems unnecessary to further discuss the matter, as when you return to London, where the accounts are, and consult with those who were responsible, you will see that the position you have assumed is simply untenable.

As regards the extracts from the Annual Letters which I appended to my letter of the 4th ult., your position seems to be this, as far as I can understand it. You admit the letters were intended to encourage independence in the Native Churches, but you say that they in no way sanction the idea that these churches could continue to receive any pecuniary help from the Society, or that the European missionaries could be the heads of these independent Native Churches and yet continue in the pay of the Society. This is exactly what we contend the letters do mean, and it is what has occurred at Metlakahtla. The Native Christians there decided to form an independent Native Church. They expected all pecuniary help from the Society to be discontinued and were prepared to bear their own burdens. The formation of an independent Native Church by these Native Christians, while it did not alter the position of any missionary at Metlakahtla towards the Society, it necessitated his deciding whether he would at the request of these Christians give up the Society and his salary and become their minister, or continue a missionary of the Society, and seek the sphere of labour the Society might point out. In neither case did it justify the Society or him in opposing or thwarting the action of these Native Christians. When you have an opportunity of reading the letters in full, from which the extracts were taken, you will be able to judge how little the reference to Church Councils, &c., which only occurs in one letter, has to say to the matter as a whole, although you seem to base on it the idea that the letters cannot refer to Christians in the condition of those at Metlakahtla.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT TOMLINSON.

Major-General J. G. Touch.
Rev. W. R. Blackett.

To
SIR
the in
sionar
the G
ceedin
2. I
cogniz
advise
questi
3. C
sionar
only
make.
4. I
attach
It wa
David
but w
reduc
Odill
preter
reord
contai
appea
the su
5.
of pa
maint
the t
surve
claim
who
Missi
and a
obstr
6.
Nove
opera
ment
notic
Bruce

APPENDIX K.

TO THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH
COLUMBIA, VICTORIA.

June 7th, 1886.

SIR,—Having during a six weeks' residence at Metlakahtla completed the inquiry, to institute which we were sent out by the Church Missionary Society, we have the honour to submit, for the information of the Government of Victoria, a copy of the record of our formal proceedings with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan.

2. It may not be within the province of the Government to take cognizance of much that is contained in that record; but we consider it advisable that it should be furnished in a complete form, in case of any question arising in our absence as to any part of its contents.

3. Our intercourse with the Indians attached to the Church Missionary Society was unrestricted and informal, and of that we have only notes to secure accuracy of statement in the report we have to make.

4. It will be observed that at the second meeting with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan, the communication is in the form of a letter. It was desired that we should hand it over, after interpretation by David Leask, to be discussed by the Indians in a meeting of their own; but we insisted on all our communications being *viva voce* (though reduced to writing), and interpreted at least in the presence of Mrs. Odill Morrison, whom they eventually preferred to accept as the interpreter. Their answers and questions were sent to us in writing, as recorded; and it will be obvious that these communications do not contain the spontaneous expression of the opinion of the Indians, who appeared to us, as a body, quite incompetent to deal intelligently with the subject.

5. We invite the attention of Government to the notice at the bottom of page 41 of the record,* from which it appears that the Indians still maintain their claim to Mission Point, although Government has asserted the trust for the Church Missionary Society by having the two acres surveyed and demarcated since the Government Commission sat. The claim of the Indians was also recently re-asserted by Mr. Tomlinson, who took objection to repairs being made to the roof of the Church Mission House, pending the settlement of the question. The repairs and alterations were executed, notwithstanding his threats of forcible obstruction by the refusal to allow the necessary lumber to be landed.

6. The Commission which assembled at Metlakahtla on the 14th November, 1884, arranged that the minority should suspend building operations, and both sides interference with one another, till Government had decided the question at issue; and we desire to bring to the notice of Government that the houses of both Moses Venn and Donald Bruce are still in the state they then were, and to request that Govern-

* This refers to the MS. The Notice is on page 35.

ment may be pleased to issue such instructions as will admit of these men providing themselves, without molestation, with suitable habitations, as they greatly complain of the inconvenience to which the present state of suspense subjects them. May we respectfully request an early decision on this point?

7. In the absence of Mr. Elliott, there appears to be no stipendiary magistrate in the vicinity of Metlakatla.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(Signed)

J. G. TOUCH.

W. R. BLACKETT.

”

APPENDIX L.

TO THE RIGHT HONBLE. SIR JOHN MACDONALD, K.C.B., D.C.L., Q.C.,
SUPERINTENDENT-GENERAL OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, OTTAWA.

SIR,—Having in pursuance of instructions from the Committee of the Church Missionary Society spent six weeks at Metlakatla for the purpose of prosecuting an inquiry into the state of matters in that Mission, we have the honour to submit a copy of the record of our formal proceedings with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan.

2. It may not be within the province of the Superintendent-General to take cognizance of much that is contained in that record, but we consider it advisable that it should be furnished in a complete form in case of any question arising after we have left the country, as to any part of its contents. A copy has also been forwarded to the Provincial Government at Victoria.

3. Our intercourse with the Indians attached to the Church Missionary Society was unrestricted and informal, and of that we have only notes to secure accuracy of statement in the report we have to make.

4. It will be observed that at the second meeting with the Indians attached to Mr. Duncan the communication is in the form of a letter. It was desired that we should hand it over, after interpretation by David Leask, to be discussed by the Indians in a meeting of their own, but we insisted on all our communications being *viva voce* (though reduced to writing), and interpreted at least in the presence of Mrs. Odill Morrison, whom they eventually preferred to accept as the interpreter. Their answers and questions were sent to us in writing as recorded, and it will be obvious that these communications do not contain the spontaneous expression of the opinions of the Indians, who appeared to us as a body quite incompetent to deal with the subject.

5. We invite attention to the notice at page 40 of the record,* from which it appears that the Indians still maintain their claim to Mission Point, raised after the severance of Mr. Duncan from the Society, and

* This refers to the MS. The Notice is on page 35.

they pr
has ass
the tw
Govern
of Nov
Mr. To
made
alterati
obstruc
that th
genera
this co
6. I
moved
acres,
subject
him in
not ma
matter
Govern
7. T
buildin
issue,
been p
own h
of pro
8. v
observ
of us
assum
Their
plainl
giving
the S
out th
in the
Mr. D
in fo
law o
in the
contra
under
Indian
Metla
The
strikin
must
9.
gover
as he

they press that claim, notwithstanding that the Provincial Government has asserted the trust for the Church Missionary Society by having the two acres surveyed and demarcated subsequent to the sitting of the Government Commission which assembled at Metlakatla on the 14th of November, 1884. The claim has also been recently re-asserted by Mr. Tomlinson, who took objection to repairs and alterations being made to the roof of the Church Mission House. The repairs and alterations were carried out, notwithstanding his threats of forcible obstruction, and no obstruction was offered. We desire to point out that the claim of the Indians to these two acres is based upon the general principle asserted by them, that the fee simple of the land in this country belongs to them by hereditary right.

6. It did not appear to us that the Indians themselves were much moved by the land question, on which, as far as it affected the two acres, we had to address them, and efforts made to excite them on that subject to all appearance failed. Mr. Duncan, in our interview with him in London before we left, informed us that if Mission Point were not made over to the Indians by Government he would carry the matter into court. At Metlakatla he informed us that the Dominion Government were to try the question in the courts.

7. The Commission arranged that the minority should suspend building on the reserve until Government had decided the question at issue, and those who have for the long period which has since elapsed been prevented from repairing and erecting suitable habitations on their own holdings, complain greatly of the inconvenience which this state of protracted suspense involves.

8. We venture to submit our opinion, after careful inquiry and observation, and visits to Port Essington and Fort Simpson, and of one of us to Kincolith, that the Indians if left to themselves would not assume the attitude they do towards the Society and the Government. Their bearing was generally very friendly, even after we had spoken plainly on the question, and we would specially record our belief that giving effect to the Indian Act at Metlakatla and the other stations of the Society, and the appointment of a competent Indian agent to carry out the law, would remedy the present evils arising from the fact that in the absence of such authority, the self-constituted authority of Mr. Duncan, to whom we ungrudgingly accord the credit of a great work in former years for the benefit of the Indians, supersedes the law of the land and imposes on the people conditions of remaining in the village which appear to us to be oppressive and tyrannical, and contrary to the principles of civil and religious liberty. We cannot understand the reasonableness of his objection to the application of the Indian Act on the ground of the advanced state of the Indians at Metlakatla. This plea does not appear to us to be borne out by fact. The early efforts of Mr. Duncan we acknowledge to have been strikingly successful, but the effect of the policy now pursued is, and must be, retrograde.

9. We do not undertake to predict what the effect of constitutional government would be on the numbers who attach themselves to him, as he has special inducements to offer them to remain with him, but

it is obvious to us that the system of boycotting, which any one who leaves him has to endure, and the disadvantages to which he is subjected, make it very difficult for the people to follow the dictates of their own judgment and desires in making an election.

10. These difficulties are not so great as they were, as the action taken since the Government Commission sat has tended to restrain the unwarrantable regulations and penal acts of the present council, which on its present footing, without any legal constitution, becomes an engine of oppression and injustice, and in the absence of any stipendiary magistrate, or of any Indian agent, exercises its sway, only restrained when it so far exceeds the bounds of justice as to call for special interposition.

11. The Indians at Kincolith, who appear to be quite loyal, earnestly pleaded for some representative of Government to give effect to the arrangements as to the Reserve fixed by Mr. O'Reilly, with which they are quite satisfied, as in the absence of such functionary, especially during the season when there is a great concourse of Indians on the Naas for hoolican fishing, permanent residences are erected by Indians who have no claim to be on the Reserve, even on the gardens of the Kincolith Indians; and the case of one white man, whom Mr. O'Reilly warned to leave the Reserve, and who, after Mr. O'Reilly's departure, extended his appropriation of ground, was cited.

12. They also pointed out that the amount of firewood used by the concourse of Indians during the hoolican fishing, seriously told upon their own supply, and thus pleaded for some special forest-land on Observatory Inlet to be set apart to meet such abnormal requirements.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

(Signed) J. G. TOUCH.

W. R. BLACKETT.

*Victoria, British Columbia,
8th June, 1886.*

0
f
1
.
3
-
7
.
7
3
1
7
3
3
3
7
3
1
1

