

land was chosen for them by Dr. Grain and Ernest Rayner, of Selkirk, men selected by the Indians themselves. How can it be said that the Indians were wrongfully used?

It has been hinted that there was collusion in connection with the sale of the land put up at public auction. What foundation is there for any such insinuation? The sale was advertised in the usual way, in some five or six newspapers, the Toronto 'Globe', the 'Free Press', a Winnipeg paper and a Selkirk paper and another journal. It was advertised under order in council passed by the Dominion government in 1894; and for the purpose of my argument, I desire to call attention to that order in council because it has been alleged that the sale was not properly advertised. The order in council was dated May 8, 1894, and I believe a similar order was made on December 12, 1896. The order in council of May 8, 1894 reads as follows:

Advertisements should not be inserted in any books, pamphlets or periodicals other than newspapers published weekly or more frequently, and all advertisements should be limited to the maximum of six insertions in daily or weekly papers.

The sale of these lands was, therefore, properly advertised and there was a fairly large attendance at the auction. The lands were purchased by 24 different buyers—I do not know, nor do I care, whether Liberal or Conservative. Surely no one will say that there was collusion at that auction sale. Under ordinary circumstances collusion at an auction sale is very difficult. The lands were sold at an average price of \$5.70 per acre. Compare that with prices realized for the sale of other lands in that district. In June, 1909, six months later than the sale of the Indian lands, certain school lands were sold in the same locality. Three-quarters of section 29, township 14, range 6, east first meridian, sold at \$5 per acre at public auction; southeast quarter of section 29 was offered for sale at an upset price of \$5, but there were no bids. Section 11, of township 14, range 6, one-half section sold at \$5 per acre and one-quarter sold at \$5.50 per acre. The fourth quarter was offered at an upset price of \$5, but there was no bid. Three-quarters of section 29, township 15, range 6, was sold at \$5 per acre. The fourth quarter-section was put up at the upset price of \$5, but no bids were offered. The inspector of the school lands, in making his report of the sale of school lands in that district, said that these lands were very much inferior to other lands in Manitoba. I know it has been said by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) that these lands were worth at least \$25 per acre. But I know where you can buy lands within 25 miles of the city of Winnipeg at \$17 per acre to-day just as good as any land on St. Peter's Indian

reserve. But in any event to say that the lands are worth \$25 an acre to-day is no indication that they were worth more than \$5.70 in 1908, because lands have increased in value by leaps and bounds in those few years. I know that lands have doubled in value within the last year and a half or two years at the most.

I have nothing further to say on this question. I merely rose for the purpose of putting at rest the allegations of hon. gentlemen opposite respecting the conduct of the Superintendent General of Indian affairs, Mr. Pedley; and although I have referred to a number of the sections of Mr. Pedley's affidavit, I think it but right that I should place it in its entirety on 'Hansard':

Province of Ontario, county of Carleton, to wit.

I, Frank Pedley, of the city of Ottawa, in the county of Carleton, in the province of Ontario, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, make oath and say:

1. That I have read the speech of Mr. Bradbury, member for Selkirk, delivered in the House of Commons on the 30th day of April, 1910, with reference to the surrender of St. Peter's Indian reserve, and with particular reference to the statements alleged to have been made by me as contained on page 7191 of the House of Commons Debates, and I have heard the said Bradbury to-day reiterate the said statements.

2. That I was present during the whole of the meeting referred to and submitted the terms of the surrender clause by clause to all the Indians assembled, and each clause of the said surrender was carefully explained to the Indians both in the English language and in the language of the Indians by an interpreter acceptable to the Indians and firmly believe that every Indian present at that meeting thoroughly understood the terms of the surrender.

3. The said meeting lasted for two days, and during that time a full discussion took place in which a great many of the Indians participated, and any Indian who desired to ask for any information was given the fullest opportunity of doing so.

4. On the day when the vote was taken it was decided by the meeting unanimously, just before the noon adjournment, that the vote should be taken at a certain hour in the afternoon of the same day. This was done, and out of a possible vote of 270 in the entire band there were 205 votes cast on the question of the surrender. The vote was counted by the Indian agent and the inspector of Indian agencies, and was checked over by Wm. Asham, who was opposed to the surrender, and by one other whose name I do not remember. Not one objection was raised either to the vote itself or to the method of taking it.

5. With reference to the payment to the Indians of the sum of \$5,000 referred to by Mr. Bradbury, I positively state that the Indians were informed by me that in case of a surrender of the reserve being taken, the department proposed to advance the Indians the amount of \$5,000 in accordance with the