

Mr. BRADBURY. With the chiefs and council who were purchased to betray the band.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend admits that these negotiations have been going on for that length of time. As to the allegation of bribery of the chiefs, there was a man named, I do not know what, who presented a bill to the department and the bill was not paid, but my hon. friend undertakes to make the House believe that the land that the chiefs got in some way or other paid this man's bill. Whether the chief got much land or little land, whether they got what was coming to them or got more or less according to the vote of the band, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they got that land and that if they were like any other Indians I know of in the world they kept the land or they kept the price of it, and they certainly did not give it to this gentleman whom my hon. friend suggests received his money back in that way. The hon. gentleman is suggesting something that is utterly absurd as everybody in the House knows, and he speaks of this as an instance of bribery just as he speaks about the giving to the Indians of a reserve one and a half times as great as the one they had abandoned, besides the price of the one they had abandoned, as robbery of the Indians.

I do not know that it is worth while to consider the repetition that he gave of the allegation made last year in regard to Mr. Semmens or in regard to what Mr. Pedley said at the meeting. He is not prepared to accept Mr. Pedley's word and he is not prepared to accept Mr. Semmens' word.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister has never denied that fact to the House, Mr. Pedley has never denied it, and there is no denial because Mr. Pedley wrote it in his own letters.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to what Mr. Pedley said to the Indians, when Mr. Pedley is alleged to have said: I have \$5,000 in my valise; if you vote 'yea' you will get it, and if you do not vote 'yea' you will not get it, this is what Mr. Semmens says on oath:

Province of Ontario, county of York, to wit.
I, John Semmens, of the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba, inspector of Indian agencies, make oath and say:

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

2. That I was present during the whole of the meeting referred to and heard what was

said by the Deputy Superintendent General with respect to the proposed surrender, and in answer to the various questions by the Indians.

3. That the following statement which the hon. member said he was informed was made by the Deputy Superintendent General, namely, 'I have \$5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender to-night I will distribute this \$5,000 amongst you; if you do not vote for this surrender, I will take my bag and go home, and you won't get a cent,' was not made by the Deputy Superintendent General as quoted, but as explained in paragraph five hereof.

4. That the document containing the terms of the surrender was read and interpreted to the Indians at the meeting referred to, and the whole matter was discussed and explained, the Indians taking great interest in the proceedings.

5. That during the discussion of the following clause, 'the department shall advance at the time of the surrender the sum of \$5,000, to be repaid out of the first moneys received from the sale of the lands,' some one asked if the \$5,000 would be distributed among the Indians if they did not surrender, and he was informed by the Deputy Superintendent General that this could not be done, as under the law the \$5,000 would be paid only on surrender being given and in accordance with the terms mentioned in the surrender. The Deputy Superintendent General further explained that the law allowed the advance to be made at the time of surrender, and that whatever money was so advanced would be charged against the funds of the band.

(Sgd.) JOHN SEMMENS.

Sworn before me at the city of Toronto, in the county of York, this 17th day of January, 1911.—R. J. Gibson, a commissioner in H.C.J.

My hon. friend has the evidence on that point at any rate, and he will recall, I think, that the statement that Mr. Semmens said to the Indians: Those who want \$90 go to one side and those who do not want it, go to the other side, was denied in this House last year, and if it was not denied then I, on the authority of Mr. Semmens, take the fullest responsibility for absolutely denying it now.

My hon. friend is anxious to have an investigation. An investigation of what? The facts are all here. The reserve has been sold, the purchasers' names are on the table of the House, the price paid is in the hands of the House, the Indians are receiving their money as it is paid in. What, I ask you, is there to investigate?—nothing except the unfounded allegations that my hon. friend has made, in support of which he has not been able to bring a scrap of evidence even at the third attempt before this House. When the sales by the individual Indians were made there was a question as to whether they were receiving payment or not. The law clerk of the Indian Department was sent to Winnipeg and he took up on behalf of these Indians the question of the sale and saw that the terms