

down in order that they might make up their minds on the subject, or he would not have moved for them. If he had all the information requisite to form an opinion, there was no necessity for his motion; but if not, he should have reserved comment until he could have spoken with some guarantee of correctness. There was evidently not a parliamentary animus actuating the hon. gentleman, when he said there are two Lieutenant Governors concerned in this, and that he would give their names if I asked for them; and wound up by saying that one of them was Lieutenant Governor Dewdney. He does not assert, but he insinuates, that Lieutenant Governor Dewdney is the purchaser of this place; and he insinuates this because two Lieutenant Governors drove out together and went over the farm together. That is the evidence he adduces to show that Lieutenant Governor Dewdney had an interest in the purchase of this farm. The hon. gentleman should remember that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, Mr. Dewdney, is the Commissioner for the management of Indian Affairs, and it was his duty to visit the farm. He was instructed to do so, and to report to the Government and the Department, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Therefore, in the performance of his duty, not as Lieutenant Governor, but as Commissioner, he went, in obedience to instructions, to make a valuation, and he did make it. That is the whole basis of the attack on Mr. Dewdney. Why this gentleman, because he is a public official, should be held liable to insinuations of that kind from an hon. member in his place, I do not see. It is a grave thing to make those charges. He has said that he heard from hon. gentlemen on this side that the people were very indignant over the matter. Well, this farm, a good many years ago, in the early settlement of that country, when there were few or no settlers, no means of getting provisions, and no railways, was laid out as a supply farm for the Indians. It was considered as a tentative matter, and the previous Government, I believe, laid this place out as a supply farm for Indians—the Blackfeet, and all those tribes stretching across the foot of the Rocky Mountains. The farm was not surveyed, but the site was taken up as an eligible one by the officers of that day, without reference to future surveys of any kind. The hon. gentleman will find, by the report of Mr. Wadsworth, that from some cause or other this farm has not been a commercial and financial success. The time has passed for the necessity of a supply farm of this kind, and the authorities of the Indian Department thought necessary to close this bill of expense which was annually a loss. It was closed, and the farm was transferred back to the Indian Department, ceasing to be an Indian farm. Then we had to consider what was to be done with it. It is a farm of some 4,500 acres more or less—I am not sure whether it has been surveyed yet or not; perhaps it has; but the moment it went back to the Department of Interior, it became, like other public lands in the North-West, open to homesteading and pre-emption, and also giving the Canadian Pacific Railway a claim to the odd numbered sections, a portion being within the twenty four mile belt. They had a right to their land, and if there were any school lands included, as I suppose there would be in those 4,500 acres, they were to be dealt with under the law relating to school lands. Over this farm were scattered buildings, principally of logs and of some years duration, which would be of little or no value if the farm were broken up in quarter-sections, except for the material they would afford the homesteader, who, mind you, was to get the land for nothing. If this land was not sold as one farm, it would have to be broken up into quarter-sections, and any homesteader could get land under the law upon entering himself for it as such. The hon. gentleman says this place ought to be put up at public auction. Well, we could not put it up as a whole farm at public auction, because the Government did not own it as a whole farm. Lieutenant Governor Robitaille, who took a fancy to the place, and who says as

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

soon as his term of office is over he is going to transfer himself to the North-West to settle there—

Mr. COOK. Is he going to take his piggery with him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say my hon. friend will find a very hospitable reception if he visits him there in the North-West. It could not be sold as a whole farm, and Mr. Robitaille was told he could make his own bargains with the Canadian Pacific Railway for their lands; but that as far as the school lands were concerned he could not get them, as they must be kept to be dealt with under the law which prescribes the mode of selling school lands. It can only be sold by public auction, and only when it has been surveyed, and at a price equivalent to the price which is obtained for the neighbouring lands. Therefore he did not get this 4,500 acres. He only got those portions of it that belonged to the Canadian Government. He did not get the Canadian Pacific Railway lands; he did not get the school lands; and he only got the even-numbered sections when surveyed. Now, these buildings were, as I have stated, of comparatively little value, and we could not put them up to auction. It was of great importance to get some person who would buy the whole farm. Mr. Robitaille said: "I have seen the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, and I think I shall be able to make a bargain with them; I will run my risk of that." I will read, Mr. Speaker, from a report of the Deputy Minister. When I saw, yesterday, that the hon. gentleman showed symptoms of making a speech, I brought the papers over here, though it is rather inconvenient to quote papers higglety-pigglety in this way, when they are not before the House. On June 28th, 1883, the Deputy of the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Burgess, made this report to me as Minister of the Interior:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, June 28th, 1883.

"SIR,—I have the honour to direct attention to the fact that the Deputy of the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs has notified this Department that the tract of land known as the Fish Creek Farm, situated near the junction of the Fish Creek with the Bow River, in the District of Alberta, North-West Territories, is no longer required for Indian purposes, and possession of the same has been surrendered to this Department, to be dealt with as may be deemed proper.

"The Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs further states that it is proposed to dispense at once with the services of the person now in charge of the farm buildings and premises.

"Permit me respectfully to submit that, in order to dispose of this property to the best advantage, it is desirable that it should be sold at once, as every day's delay means deterioration of the farm buildings and decrease in the value of the breaking and all the other improvements.

"Moreover the tract of land attached to the buildings having, up to this period, been cultivated as one farm, it would be in the public interest to sell it in one block intact, so that the full value of the improvements made thereon by the Indian Department may be realized.

"I have, therefore, the honour to recommend that the authority of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, as required by section 24 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, be asked for the sale by this Department of the farm (with the buildings thereon) known as the Fish Creek Indian Farm, as shown on the tracing herewith, and more particularly described as follows:—

Here follows the description—

"Subject, however, when the surveys of the land have been made and confirmed, to any rights therein which may accrue by law to the Hudson's Bay Company."

Yes, the Hudson's Bay Company—I said the Canadian Pacific Company—

"And the school endowment; and subject also to such rights, if any, in the odd numbered sections therein which may accrue to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under 44 Vic., chap. 1.

"The price to be not less than \$3 an acre."

That is the report of Mr. Burgess. Subsequently that report was adopted, and I may say here that we considered that \$3 an acre was a very good price indeed. The nominal price of land by the Statute was \$1 an acre, and to get \$2 an acre additional for the old log buildings we considered was a very good bargain. The hon. gentleman says the land is worth more now. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is just now a boom at Calgary, something like the