

Davidson & Company, and not only that, but the Neelby Hotel had been erected there after the ground had been selected by the Government, and after the parties must have known that the reservation had been made. The Secretary of State, feeling he could not meet the force of the statements, because they were true, suggested at that time that I should accept a committee and prove the statements I had made to the House. I shall read what he said in referring to the information about the dredging. He said there was no objection to the papers coming down, and he added :—

“The statement that these lands had been purchased at \$4 per acre, and sold to the Government afterwards at \$500 per acre, was not true to the extent the hon. gentleman supposed. Some of these lands might have been purchased from the Ontario Government years ago at low prices, but in many instances they had changed hands frequently, and at prices quite as high as the valuers had placed upon them. He suggested that this matter might be investigated by the same Committee that was now engaged in enquiring into the best route for the Pacific Railway. It was a duty the hon. gentleman owed to the country, if he believed the valuers to be guilty of fraud, to have them examined and this matter thoroughly investigated.

“Hon. Mr. Aikins—I did not say they had committed fraud.

“Hon. Mr. Scott said if the charges against them were true they had committed fraud.”

That is, that they had paid five or six hundred dollars for lots which had shortly before been purchased from the Ontario Government for four dollars a lot. Then he goes on to say, that if I asked for a committee, he would second the motion. He has not only fallen foul of that Committee, but also of the House, because it refused to alter the names on that Committee at all.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Allow me to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the Official Report of the Debates, and to show him that if he had not allowed his feelings to get the better of his judgment, his memory would have served him better. I find, in reference to the appointment of the Committee to inquire into the communication with the North-West, a question did take place as to who

Hon. Mr. Aikins.

should constitute that Committee, which was asked for by the hon. Senator from Manitoba (Mr. Girard). The hon. Secretary of State said it was quite unprecedented for an Opposition to have a majority on such a committee; but the Committee was appointed, and it had about got through with its work, when the hon. Secretary of State was so well satisfied with the manner in which the Committee conducted the investigation, that he was quite willing this reference should be made to it, and he actually suggested it himself. He has nothing to complain of now, and certainly no ground for making the charge that the House refused to allow any one who had been suggested by the Government to be appointed to that Committee. The reference was to inquire into the lands purchased on the Kaministiquia. The hon. gentleman to-day would leave the impression on the House that, had that Committee dealt fairly with him, or had the opportunity been afforded him, he would have brought evidence to fully establish—more than establish—the ground he had taken that the Government had not paid too much for these lands, but had acted fairly throughout this whole matter, and that the best point had been selected for the terminus.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I did not say the Committee had prevented me.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—The hon. gentleman said he had not an opportunity of calling some witnesses.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I said I could not call Mr. McKellar during the winter.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—The hon. gentleman said, when the reference was made, that three witnesses would be all he need call before the Committee to satisfy them and the House his statements were correct, and he named those witnesses. They were Mr. Sandford Fleming, and the two valuers; but the hon. gentleman has called no less than twenty-one witnesses.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—To meet evidence on the other side.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—The number of witnesses called on the other side was