

to Manitoba last year to make an investigation:

I am a member of the St. Peter's band of Indians, and that I was present at the time of the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve, and declare that when the vote was just about to be taken to decide whether the reserve should be surrendered or not, I heard John Semmens, inspector of Indian agencies, make a short speech in the Cree language, and said to all those present, that those wanting the \$90 to go over there, indicating the place where they should stand who favoured the surrender.

In the face of these sworn statements, the hon. minister has endeavoured, more by insinuation or assertion than by argument, to leave the impression on the House that the charge which I made on the strength of these affidavits was unfounded; but he stated that out of consideration for my feelings he was only generalizing. The consideration of the hon. gentleman was wonderful. Perhaps he was only generalizing when he began his remarks with the attack he made on me. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that his methods deceive no one, not even himself, in his rather clumsy effort to cast ridicule upon my attempts to secure justice for the Indians and to discharge a very important duty which I owe, not only to the Indians, but to myself as a man. I believe every word that I stated in this House to be absolutely true. I believe that if I had not brought this case before parliament as the representative of that district, I would have been unworthy of the position I occupy as a member of this House for the county of Selkirk, in which this matter occurred. The hon. minister, in his attempt to minimize the disgraceful deception practiced on the poor Indians, did not dare to deny the serious charge that one of his officials, just as the Indians were to be divided for a vote, made use of the following language in Cree: 'All you that want \$90 go to that side,' indicating where the chief and council were standing. The hon. minister evades this charge by pointing out who the official was, and stating that he was a Methodist minister and had the welfare of the Indians at heart. This, Mr. Speaker, is surely no answer to such a serious charge. The fact that an official is a Methodist minister does not lessen the seriousness of the offence against everything that was fair and decent. To my mind it rather intensifies the meanness of the trick played on the poor unsuspecting Indian to secure his consent to that vote. That the Indians were tricked into the vote by methods of this kind is to my mind beyond any doubt and it is beyond my conception to realize that a man in the position of Mr. Semmens should have lent himself to such a shady transaction.

Mr. BRADBURY.

But, Mr. Speaker, there may be an explanation of the action of this gentleman, and I think there is. The fact that the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Mr. Pedley, was himself present in charge of this meeting, would I submit suggest the probability that when Mr. Semmens spoke as he did he was simply carrying out part of a well-laid scheme arranged beforehand to secure the necessary votes to assure the surrender. I cannot think that Mr. Semmens ever made that statement as he did, and just at the physiological moment, without some distinct prearrangement and without some instruction from his superior officer. I am satisfied that this whole matter was arranged and that when Mr. Pedley went to Selkirk he went there determined to secure that surrender by fair or foul means, and he secured it to suit himself. But, Mr. Speaker, I intend later on to refer to the fact that while he secured that alleged surrender which seems to satisfy the minister, I contend that today there is no surrender of St. Peter's Indian Reserve according to the true meaning of the Indian Act. During the hon. gentleman's long speech, he did not deny, and in fact he did not refer to the more serious charge which was supported by many sworn declarations, namely, that the Deputy Superintendent General himself just on the eve of taking the vote and a few minutes previous to the instructions given to his agents to which I have just referred, endeavoured to bribe the Indians by an offer of money. The meeting was in session and the Deputy Superintendent General stated:

It is time to take the vote. I have \$5,000 here in my valise. If you agree to this surrender this money will be divided among you, but if you don't agree to the surrender, I will take my satchel and go home, and you won't get a cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that there may be no misunderstanding I wish to refer to one or two of the declarations that I placed on record last year, and which were before the minister when he made his remarks. These declarations are so long that I will not weary the House by reading them all, but I shall quote from them a few paragraphs. William Asham, says, speaking at the meeting:

Now, soon after this, we were in the heat of a hot discussion in the matter regarding the surrender. Mr. Pedley during his speech at this time said I have \$5,000 here, pointing to a satchel at his side. If you agree to this surrender this money will be distributed among you, but if you don't agree to the surrender, I will take my satchel and go home and you won't get a cent. Then we were told the time had come to take a vote.

You notice Mr. Speaker, how these two offers were arranged. First it was the \$5,000, and then he says: