

(Mr. Bradbury), who has taken a very deep interest in the matter of the surrender of the reserve, has from time to time laid great stress upon the injustice that was done the Indians in this transaction. That injustice was in paying them for the land that they had, and giving them in the place of it a greater area of better land. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) shakes his head. He is inclined to deny the latter part of my statement. I propose to read to him the opinion of the Indian agent as to the benefit to the Indians of their removal to the new reserve. In the annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1914, he says:

The movement of the people from St. Peter's continues, it has not been as rapid as I hoped it would be. Those who are still in residence at St. Peter's have been advised that the time for receiving assistance from the department for moving and building has about expired, and it has been pointed out to them that the advantage gained in this way is too valuable for them to run any risk of losing it; there is now a pretty definite intention to move, one or two of the leaders have gone, and I hope to see many others arrange to do so during the coming season. Arrangements have been made to assist them in building, when they arrive at Peguis; a sufficient quantity of lumber and other building material has been placed there with Agent Carter, during the past winter, to meet any demands made for this purpose. It is realized by them that they will be acting in their own best interest, if they move, as they find that those who have moved are doing well at Peguis.

I think I may rest the case there for the present. We now have the evidence as to the benefit the white people derive from the taking of this surrender, and it is given by those who are in a measure entitled to speak for the white people. We also have the evidence of the officers of the department as to the benefit to the Indians of their taking advantage of the arrangement that was made. I think under those circumstances my hon. friend from Selkirk will have to consider that he is in a minority on this question.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): The hon. member for Edmonton, the ex-Minister of the Interior in the late Government (Mr. Oliver), the man responsible for this transaction, speaking before the House rose at one o'clock, made some statements in my absence which I deem it wise to refer to. But before doing so I wish to refer to one or two things that he said just before he resumed his seat.

Speaking of the advantage that has accrued to the St. Peter's Indians from the surrender, the hon. gentleman would seek

to leave the impression on the people that the surrender was a good thing for the Indians. Let us examine for a moment that feature of the matter. St. Peter's Indian Reserve was adjacent to the town of Selkirk; in fact, it formed a part of that town. It comprised 48,000 acres within 26 miles of Winnipeg. That land is worth to-day \$2,500,000 if it is worth a dollar. On the evidence of some men that the hon. gentleman has quoted as being present at that meeting, and asking that these titles should be validated, this land was worth at the time of the surrender on an average of \$25 an acre for the 48,000 acres. The hon. gentleman seeks to leave the impression that it was a good bargain for the Indians that this change had taken place. The Government and those who desired the surrender of this 48,000 acres of the most valuable land in Manitoba, selected a site 90 miles farther north, along the west shore of lake Winnipeg, and gave the Indians 70,000 acres of land there in lieu of the 48,000 acres they had taken from them. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this land compared in value with the 48,000 acres taken from the Indians? Every man who knows anything about wild land in that part of Manitoba knows that from \$3 to \$4 an acre would be a good value to place upon this 70,000 acres of land. He acquired land from the Indians that was worth at the time it was taken \$25 to \$50 an acre. He took an estate from the St. Peter's Indians which is worth at least to-day \$2,500,000. I ask if that is considered fair treatment of the Indians of this country.

The hon. gentleman says that I have taken a great interest in the Indians. I have. And why? It is not because I have any personal interest in them, not because there was any political kudos to be gained from it; the Indian has no vote, he has no influence, he has no money. I was in the town when this outrageous transaction took place and I would have been less than a man, I would have been unworthy of the position which I occupy in this House if I had not attempted to rectify that shameful transaction and expose it to this country. I thought that when I appealed to the minister of the Interior of that time, the present hon. member for Edmonton, and, when he became seized of the facts, that I had laid before this House, he would take action and do something to rectify the great wrong which had been perpetrated on the St. Peter's Indians. But the hon. gentleman satis-