

criminal law. I am also informed by the Minister of the Interior that no such application was made to his department by anybody. Two statements were made by the hon. member for Selkirk both last year and this year, which are to my mind the crucial part of this matter. One statement, made last year at page 7035 of 'Hansard,' was:

Pedley said: 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. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he considers that bribery?

The other statement is to this effect, that the Inspector of Indian Agencies said: 'All you that want \$90 go to this side,' and they were counted in favour of surrender. Both of these statements were contained in the affidavit or declaration of Wm. Asham filed by my hon. friend; and on these statements the hon. member for Selkirk and the hon. member for West Elgin based the contention that bribery was used. I want to point out to these hon. gentlemen that the giving of money in advance in order to obtain the surrender of Indian reserves is no new thing. I am informed that every year \$50,000 is voted by this House for the purpose of obtaining surrenders of Indian reserves, and it is the custom to pay some small proportion of the money available at the outset for the purpose of binding the bargain, as it were, or beginning the completion of the surrender. Let me call my hon. friend's attention to section 89 of the Indian Act, which provides for this, so that it is not at all a bribe, but is provided for by the law of the land. Section 89 says:

With the exception of such sum not exceeding fifty per centum of the proceeds of any land, and not exceeding ten per centum of the proceeds of any timber or other property, as is agreed at the time of the surrender to be paid to the members of the band invested therein, the Governor in Council may, subject to the provisions of this parliament, direct how and in what manner and by whom the moneys arising from the disposal of Indian lands or of property held or to be held in trust for Indians, or timber or Indian lands or reserves, or from any other source for the benefit of Indians, shall be invested from time to time, and how the payments or assistance to which the Indians are entitled shall be made or given.

So that provision is made in the Indian Act itself for giving to the Indians at the time of surrender a small portion of the expected proceeds from the sale of these Indian lands. With respect to these two statements made by the hon. member for Selkirk last year and this year, the hon. Minister of the Interior read an affidavit of Semmon's, the Superintendent of Indian Agencies, denying absolutely that there was

Mr. MARTIN (Regina).

any foundation for any allegations. In the affidavit of Mr. Pedley, which I have in my hand, he makes no reference to the last statement, but I can assure hon. members, on my word as a member of this House that Mr. Pedley said to me there was absolutely no foundation for any such statement.

With respect to the \$5,000 alleged bribe, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) was pleased to call it, this is what Mr. Pedley says in his affidavit:

With reference to the payment of a sum of \$5,000 to the Indians, 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 terms of the surrender and as allowed by law.

The surrender itself provides for the payment of \$5,000 on the acceptance by the members of the band. What bribery was there in that? The next clause of the affidavit says:

I did not use the words attributed to me by Mr. Bradbury, namely, I have \$5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender to-night, I will distribute the \$5,000 among you. If you do not vote for the surrender, I will take my bag and go home and you will not get a cent.

Here is the last clause of the affidavit:

During the discussion of the clause of the surrender referring to the advance of the sum of \$5,000, I was asked by some one if this sum would be distributed among the Indians if they did not surrender.

That was a very natural question. What other reply could Mr. Pedley give than the one he did?

To this I replied that this could not be done as this sum could only be paid on a surrender being given in accordance with the terms of the document providing for the surrender.

Surely that affidavit of Mr. Pedley with respect to those two statements, and also the fact that in the Indian Act there is a provision made for the advance of a certain sum of money, disposes, in the minds of all reasonable men, of the question of bribery altogether.

My hon. friend says that the Indians were badly used. Well, there were 48,000 acres in the reserve. Of these 21,000 were distributed among the Indians—180 to the chief, 120 to each councillor and 80 to each Indian. In addition 3,000 acres were set aside for hay lands for the use of the Indians, and the balance, 24,000 acres, were sold by public auction, and the proceeds used for Indian purposes. In addition the Indians were given a new reserve of 75,000 acres further north in Manitoba and that