

get a cent." The Indians thought they were going to get \$5,000 for their vote. The Indian agent, Mr. J. O. Lewis, a man who was as guilty as the minister himself in this transaction—and that is saying a good deal—was the one who counted the votes in favour of a surrender. There was no one to check him at all. No one knows whether there was five of a majority in favour of a surrender or ten of a majority against a surrender, but it is claimed that there was nine of a majority in favour of a surrender. There was not nine of a majority of the legal voters of the band, because less than a majority was secured of the young men and old men who were qualified to vote. In other words, the Indian Act was violated as far as securing the votes of the whole band was concerned. The Act says distinctly that the majority of the male members of the band, twenty-one years of age, must be secured. Now, such a majority was not secured; consequently that surrender is illegal.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is Mr. Pedley?

Mr. BRADBURY: He was the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MORPHY: Is he in office now?

Mr. BRADBURY: No, he has been removed, or he resigned, I understand. I am not going to say that Mr. Pedley was to blame, for that would be taking an unfair advantage of an official of the department. The minister of that time must take the blame and so must the Government of which he was a member. I do not think, for a moment, that the deputy minister went out and negotiated and secured that surrender without the full consent of his minister. Consequently, what was done in securing the surrender, was done, I take it, with the full knowledge of that minister. But I must say that as hon. members who recollect the defence that that gentleman put up for that transaction will know, he displayed such utter ignorance of what had taken place that I should hesitate to believe, even now, that he really did know what was done in this matter, though, as head of the department, he is responsible.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) made the statement that if this surrender was illegal, every other surrender taken up to the present moment, was equally illegal. He is not well informed. The present Government composed of men who, when in Opposition condemned what the late Government did in this connection, took precautions to settle this matter, and not one surrender

has been taken since this Government came into power in which the Indian Act has not been lived up to scrupulously. That there may be no misunderstanding let me quote clause 5 which takes the place of clause 49 of the Indian Act:

A surrender must be assented to by a majority of the Indians whose names appear on the voters' list, who must be present at the meeting or council summoned for the purpose as hereinafter provided.

This makes plain what interpretation should have been placed on section 49. When the hon. gentleman made the statement that if the St. Peter's Indian surrender was illegal every other surrender in Canada was illegal, he is quite in error. Other surrenders taken before this matter was exposed in the House may have been as illegal as this, but I do not believe that there is anything in the records of Canada to show such a brazen attempt made to defraud the Indians as in the case of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve.

As to the matter published in the Selkirk Record and the Winnipeg Free Press, let me say this to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver): He is proprietor of a newspaper and knows a good deal about editing a newspaper, and a good deal 4 p.m. about what reliance can be placed, sometimes, on the actions of a newspaper. There has been, during the last six weeks, a campaign to stampede the present Government into a settlement of this question, not only against the interest of the Indians, but against the interest of the people of Canada and against the interest of the town of Selkirk. For I say now from my place in Parliament, and with all due deference to my friends, some of whom are connected with these resolutions, and with all due deference to the Record, that, so far as the town of Selkirk is concerned, to my mind the greatest crime that could be committed against the town would be to validate the titles of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve and hand this property over to a bunch of grafters, men who will hold the land at exorbitant prices for years to come and prevent the very result that the people want, viz., the settling up of that district. The late Government professed that they were working in the interests of the people, that they held the land in trust for the people and believed in the policy of "the land for the settlers and not for the speculators." Had they lived up to this policy they could have purchased from the Indians at a reasonable figure, and that