

dated as it should have been. I claim, and I have always claimed, that the matter should have been settled long ago. The fact that it has not been settled lies largely at the doors of the men who secured the land. They have been attempting to negotiate along a line of settlement by which the Indians would receive some further consideration, presuming that that would justify the Government in allowing the titles to be validated, but up to the present time nothing has been done. The hon. member for Edmonton read from a resolution a statement that the Indians of the St. Peter's reserve were satisfied. That resolution stated an absolute and unqualified falsehood, as the man who penned that statement knew when he put it into that resolution. The St. Peter's Indians, who have been loyal to the Crown, who have fought for this country more than once, feel that they have been defrauded by the Government of Canada. They have cried out for British fair-play ever since this surrender was taken, and they occupy the very same position to-day that they occupied six years ago. The hon. gentleman would like the impression to go abroad that the Indians are satisfied with their new reserve. Since the surrender was taken, and since the new reserve was created, in spite of all the inducements that could be offered by the Indian Department, less than half of the St. Peter's band of Indians have moved to the new reserve. They are at present in destitute circumstances. They are a charge upon the public of Canada to-day because of the rascally conduct of the late Administration in allowing them to be robbed of their inheritance. More than the Indian is involved in this transaction, because if the Indian is destitute, as he is to-day, the taxpayers of Canada have to take care of him. When this valuable estate was taken from the Indians and given to a few particular friends of the late Government, those people were robbing not only the Indians but the people of Canada. The consequence is to-day that the people of Canada have to dig down into their pockets to provide food and shelter for the remnant of the St. Peter's band that is left on the old reserve. At this late date in the session, I do not want to take up too much time, but the charge has been made by my hon. friend, although, frankly speaking, I would have thought that the hon. gentleman who was guilty, who was the man responsible for the transaction, would hardly have had the temerity

[Mr. Bradbury.]

to rise in his place and read those newspaper articles which he read to-day and make such statements in regard to the St. Peter's Reserve. People in glass houses should not throw stones. He knows as well as any one does that he and his department were guilty in allowing this surrender to be taken as it was. If the surrender had been taken fairly and honestly; if the Indian had been given notice for a week or ten days that surrender was to be taken; if he had been invited to meet the representatives of the department to discuss the arrangement openly and frankly, and if he had then agreed to the surrender, you would never have heard any complaint from any one in the town of Selkirk or anywhere else. I will tell you how the vote was taken. After two days' discussion in a little bit of a room, 18 x 24, where not one-half of the Indians could get in to hear what was taking place, the vote was taken. Indian after Indian swore before the commission that they had never heard the terms of the surrender read or explained to them; and that they did not know what they were voting for. This is how the vote was taken: The men were ordered out of the room into the open. There stood on one side the chief and the councillors who were in favour of this surrender, the men who, it turned out afterwards, had been bribed and purchased by those interested in securing the lands, because some of them got ten or twelve times as much land as the ordinary Indian got. Therefore, I am justified in saying that those men were bribed to secure the consent of the rest of the band. The evidence goes to show that no attempt was made to check the vote. The Indians were passing from one side to the other. A minister of the gospel, Rev. John Semmens, following out his instructions, no doubt, from Mr. Pedley, who was on the ground, when the vote was to be taken got on a box and said to those people: "All you who want \$90, come to this side." I have under my hand the evidence of the chief who was in favour of this surrender. He swore that the statement made by Mr. Semmens caused the surrender to justify. Is anything further required to justify my statement as to fraud? Before the Indians left the room to go out to vote, Mr. Pedley, in discussing the matter with the Indians, said to them: "I have \$5,000 here in this little black satchel; if the surrender carries, the money will be divided amongst you, and if it does not carry, I will take the money home and you will not