

sown grain. The farm at Fish Creek was also visited by a severe hail storm in July, which damaged the growing crops considerably. These storms are said to be usual in this country. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the farms in the neighbourhood, where the land was properly prepared and sowed early, have yielded fair crops of barley and oats, showing that these grains may be raised successfully; peas will also yield good returns, but there being no demand for them at present they are not cultivated to any extent. They would make a valuable addition to the food supply for the Indians. Wheat is more uncertain; but, I think, more from the inferiority of the seed used, and the want of care in preparing it before sowing so as to prevent smut, than from the unsuitableness of the climate and soil."

We find, however, that as the reports come down year after year these difficulties disappear, and in the end they are able to grow crops successfully; and this property is said by the Inspector of Indian Agencies to be a valuable property. I find that Mr. Wadsworth, Inspector of Indian Agencies and Farms, in his report to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, dated on the 1st of December, 1881, and appearing in the Sessional Papers of 1882, speaks of this farm in these words:

"I next visited the Fish Creek Supply Farm, arriving there on the 5th May. Mr. J. J. McHugh was in charge, having reached there from Rivière Qui Barre some ten days previously. He was actively engaged in putting in the seed, grain, roots, &c.; although in some degree hampered by inexperienced workmen and lack of horse power he was making good progress. The quantity of land broken here is 465 acres, most of which is fenced; that the farm is very badly equipped for extensive operations is apparent. In a country where wages are high, and food enormously dear, it stands to reason that to farm profitably labour-saving machines must be extensively used, also that horses should be used instead of oxen."

You will observe that this report is dated on the 1st of December, 1881, and has reference to the proceedings of that year. You will also observe that the report speaks of 465 acres having been cultivated, nearly all of which was fenced. I find in the Sessional Papers for 1883 a report from the same gentleman to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, having reference to the year 1882. He says:

"The crops on the supply farms have not been very good. There will be between one and two thousand bushels on the Fish Creek Farm, also a large crop of peas and barley. The peas I shall send for seed to the reserves next spring, as I think they will be good to grow for food. The Indians can make soup of them. At Calgary, the Sarcees were not so successful, but we managed to take in a good many potatoes and other seed for next spring from the Fish Creek Farm, and I hope, next year, to make a good showing on this reserve."

There is nothing there that would indicate that the authorities up there, who had supervision and charge of this farm, communicated to the Government that it was desirable that the farm should be sold or disposed of in any way. Mr. Wadsworth, in the same report, further says:

"Under the management of Mr. Doyle, this farm was in fine order; a large crop had been sown which promised well. My remarks upon the discontinuance of Pincher Creek Supply Farm will also apply here. I may state that it is a very valuable property, and should, if sold, realize a good sum of money."

Now, that is the report made by Mr. Wadsworth, the Inspector of Indian Agencies, to the Department, which must have been known to Mr. Dewdney, and to the Minister in charge of the Department; but there is no suggestion that the farm should be disposed of. On the contrary, in a previous portion of the same report Mr. Wadsworth speaks of the continued success of the farm, and says that ultimately it would prove of great advantage to the Indians of the North-West. Now, we were told by the hon. First Minister that the farm has been sold; that it has been sold to the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec, and sold at the magnificent sum of \$3 an acre. It has been sold privately; the public were not aware that this farm was to be put on the market; nobody, so far as I am aware, knew except Mr. Robitaille and another Lieutenant Governor. I do not know why the Government sold this farm. I am not now enquiring why. They may have had reasons, but nobody knows what these reasons were. But what I do complain of is that this farm was sold at private sale, and for at least one-third of its value. That is the estimate of gentlemen who live in the neighbourhood

of the farm—friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, men who live in the city of Calgary. These gentlemen have stated to me that the property was worth three times what the Government got for it. The hon. First Minister tells us that it was sold to Lieutenant Governor Robitaille by private sale. Will the hon. gentleman say that there is no other Lieutenant Governor interested in that sale? I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman my authority that another Lieutenant Governor is interested in this farm. I state, without fear of successful contradiction, that two Lieutenant Governors went out to that farm, inspected it, and made an estimate of its value. I know, further, that one of the Lieutenant Governors, whose name the hon. gentleman did not give to the House, was in negotiation for the sale of a portion of that farm after it was bought from the Government. I say that if that farm was sold nominally to Lieutenant Governor Robitaille, there is another Lieutenant Governor as deeply interested in it as Mr. Robitaille. I say that if that is so, it is an outrage and a scandal which the Government ought to get rid of. I do not say now that the hon. First Minister, or the Government, were aware of all the circumstances; I cannot say, until the papers come down, whether they were in communication with the other Lieutenant Governor, or not; but I do say that it is not consistent with the duty that hon. gentleman owes to the Government and the public, that a man in his position, who gets the first report about a particular piece of property, should avail himself of that information, and, either for himself or any other person, secure an interest in the property. Nobody, except the officials, is aware of what these reports contain until they are submitted to Parliament; and there is no doubt that he had full knowledge of the fact that the Inspector of Indian Agencies reported to the Government that this was a valuable property and would realize a large sum of money, else he would not have joined in purchasing it by private sale. I say no more until the documents come down. I state, not what has been told me by my political friends, but by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the city of Calgary, who complain bitterly of the sale of that property without public notice, and without the public having an opportunity of bidding for this valuable property. I contend that it is not a proper way of dealing with the public domain of this country, especially with such a property as this, upon which the Government had spent a large sum of money in cultivation, in erecting buildings, and in making other improvements. I ask the hon. gentleman if he knows that \$1,500 was spent in building a bridge across Fish Creek, which runs through the property, in order to benefit the farm? Did the Government take this into account when they sold the property to Mr. Robitaille for \$3 an acre? Does that cover the cost of all the improvements on the property? Even if it does, the Government have not received the value of the land, and they have practically given it away. Now, I say, in the first place, that it was unfair that this property should have been sold in this secret, underhand way—the public should have had an opportunity of bidding for it when it was put on the market; I say that it was sold for a great deal less than its value; I say that it was sold under circumstances which demand from the Government, if not from Parliament, a thorough enquiry; and I say that it was sold to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, and another Lieutenant Governor, I believe, was interested in the purchase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion being adopted, and the papers will be brought down at once. I rather regret the hon. gentleman did not pursue the usual course of reserving any remarks until he had the whole case before him. He has not had that advantage. He evidently considered it was important to himself, and the rest of the House, to get these papers