

fied himself with taking up three hours of the time of the House in an attempt to dispute the charges which I had made and when he sat down he left every charge unanswered and the charge made by me against the Indian Department just as strong as it was before he rose to his feet. During every session from 1907 to 1911, I appealed to the hon. gentleman across the floor of this House to do something to relieve the situation and to see that a modicum of justice was done to the poor unfortunate Indians, but I appealed in vain. The hon. gentleman made no attempt to settle the question. The late Government should have settled that question immediately, but when their attention was called to the matter in this House the present hon. member for Edmonton, the man who is responsible for this transaction, sat tight in his place and allowed the matter to drift year after year without making any attempt to settle it although he was appealed to time and time again across the floor of this House and appealed to by residents of the town of Selkirk in just as strong articles as he has read from the Record to-day. Yet he made no attempt to settle the matter. He said: What we have done, we have done, the surrender was legal and it must stand. That is the position he took. The statements I made when I opposed the transaction I made after the most thorough investigation, I made with a full knowledge of my responsibility as a member of this House, and six or seven years having elapsed since that time, I have not one word to retract of what I said on that occasion.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman briefly state what were the charges that he made?

Mr. BRADBURY: I will state some of them briefly. It would take too long to recite all of them.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not want the hon. gentleman to take too long.

Mr. BRADBURY: The charges were that the Indians had been fraudulently deprived of their very valuable estate, that the meeting called for the surrender had been manipulated by the Indian agent and by the officers of the Indian Department, that the meeting where this surrender was declared to be carried was advertised for but one day, that twenty-four hours' notice was all the time that was given to the band of Indians to gather and decide as to the surrender.

Mr. BLAIN: What year was that?

Mr. BRADBURY: That was in 1907. This reserve is about ten miles square. Many of the young Indians, at that season of the year, were at lake Winnipeg fishing. There must have been thirty or forty of the young members of the band who never heard of this meeting. I have under my hand now the testimony of men living within a mile of the place where this surrender was voted on, and these men swear that they never knew that the meeting was being held. Another charge was that the Indian Act had been violated, that clause 49 of the Act provided that a majority of the male members of the band of 21 years of age at the meeting must vote in favour of the surrender or the surrender would not be valid. That is a point in regard to which my hon. friend from Edmonton and I differ. I remember that when we were discussing this point, he was arguing in favour of the clause, and I asked him if a meeting was called where there were two hundred and some odd qualified voters, and if only twenty voters attended that meeting, could those twenty Indians legally alienate the interest of all the rest of the Indians? My answer to that question is that they could do it legally but perhaps not morally. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that in the opinion of two of the most reputable judges we have in Manitoba the position that the hon. gentleman had taken is utterly unjustifiable. A report was made by a Royal Commission appointed by the Manitoba Government and composed of three county court judges—Judges Prudhomme, Myers and Locke. Every hon. gentleman who comes from the West knows the reputation of these men. After a thorough examination of the whole case, two reports were brought in, a majority report and a minority report, but Judge Locke, speaking for himself and Judge Prudhomme, says:

The surrender was not only voidable but void, and could not be ratified and should not be ratified.

That is the decision of those men at that time. Still the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who was responsible for the transaction, for three long years while he was minister of the department that perpetrated this transaction, made no attempt to rectify it. The consequence is that it has been handed down as a heritage to the present Government. I have not argued out of the House and I am not going to argue in the House that the matter has been expe-