

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: That may be the reason, but I am pointing out that they could not have objected to the McKenna Report because they did not know what it was.

Mr. PAULL: That is the very reason. We were asked to accept something in the report which we did not know anything of. Another condition was that this report would be accepted by the two governments. The actual facts of the case are these; that the Dominion Government did not accept this report until ten years from the time this Order in Council was passed. Were the Indians to accept a report which they knew nothing of? Supposing, in 1914, the Indians had agreed to the provisions of the Royal Commission. Some of them would have been very sorry now, because great portions of the best parts of their reserve are cut out by that Commission.

Mr. DITCHBURN: You were not being asked to do that, Mr. Paull.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: That is what I am trying to impress on the minds of the Committee. Both Mr. Kelly and Mr. Paull are arguing this thing wrong. This is a voluntary act on the part of the Government to try and assist this thing to a settlement.

The WITNESS: I beg to correct that. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Stevens is just correct when he says that.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Not correct in what?

The WITNESS: In this respect: that the Commission had power, not only to make additions to the Indian lands, but to cut off, and the Indians objected to that word "cut-off". They did not know what was going to be cut off and that was one of the objections. If they agreed to that they did not know where they were going to get off at.

Mr. DITCHBURN: At that time the cut-off was only to be made with the consent of the Indians; you will remember that.

The WITNESS: Perhaps it was with the consent of the Indians. Well, that was one of the objections.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: It could not be an objection if it did not exist at that time.

Mr. DITCHBURN: There was no objection, then, because of the cut-off.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Because, as Mr. Ditchburn says, the cut-off was subsequent to the agreement by the Indians.

The WITNESS: I am just a little bit at a loss; my memory does not carry me back that far.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: There is no doubt, as far as I can discover, that the Indians were never prepared to agree; the body of Indians I came in contact with, known as the representatives of the Allied Tribes, were never prepared to agree to the full text of the land settlement, for two reasons. One that there were cut-offs which they thought were too extravagant, and the other was that they did not think they had land enough in the whole area provided for the Indians.

*By Hon. Mr. Stewart:*

Q. Those were the two reasons you gave me when we were discussing this?—A. That is quite right.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I do not know that we will get very far in discussing what might have happened or what might have been done. The fact remains that you never signed the agreement to that effect, and it is still unsigned. What I would like to get from you is this: you have put in a petition of rights to Parliament, and subsequently you have filed a petition asking that you be permitted to go to the Privy Council; that is the text of the latest petition, the one that we are discussing now?