

Act which has ever been in force has contained a provision making it an illegal proceeding to settle on land subsequent to survey without first obtaining entry thereto, the necessity of which is obvious, many of them have done so, while others have squatted on odd sections, Hudson's Bay Company and School lands, knowing that they were set apart and not open for Homestead entry. It is said that they were urged to settle in this manner by certain parties who for some reason or another thought it advisable to concentrate settlement along the banks of the river as much as possible. While on this point it might be as well to direct your attention to the fact that the contention has always been for ten chain lots, and that many have preferred and all would prefer, if the land were available, claims of twenty chains; whereas, many of the leaders in the movement have preferred claims and entered by quarter-sections, thus by their own acts protesting against the ten chain contention.

Another, and the strongest point, is that except in the cases of the claimants to those portions of Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12, lying east of the Saskatchewan in Township 45, Range 1, west 3rd, every other settler could practically obtain what he desired, by taking legal sub-divisions or portions thereof, as has since been done. I explained this to the Rev. Père André, in an interview which I had with him in the autumn of 1883, as I also did to the Rev. Père Vègréville and Mr. Charles Nolin, in an interview in January, 1884. In fact, whenever the question came up I urged these people to take their claims in this way if they insisted in settling in this manner, thus saving the expense of a re-survey and the delay incident to the same, stating also that the Government, having once surveyed the country, would not be justified in going to the expense of a re-survey merely to suit the ideas of those who settled subsequent to such survey, and further, that those who were there prior to the survey would have strong grounds for insisting on entry being given as the law and system of survey required, viz., by quarter section. If the Government in these cases made a re-survey at the public expense, every other community and settlement throughout the whole country would have as good grounds for having surveys changed to suit their convenience, whims, or caprice. Other officials of the Government have also explained this to them. In all the interviews with these people they stated that they had been promised a river-lot survey. They seem to have based this assertion on the promises made by the Minister of the Interior to the Revd. Père Leduc and Mr. Maloney of St. Albert, which was that when several had settled together prior to survey, and whose holdings could not be made to conform to the sectional system of survey, in such cases the river lot system of survey would be adopted. Attention should be particularly directed to the fact that in all the petitions and letters presented by Père Leduc and Mr. Maloney to the Minister of the Interior, not the slightest mention is made of the settlers on the South Saskatchewan desiring river lots. They represented the settlers at St. Albert, Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan. In the petition presented by Père Leduc and Mr. Maloney the settlers ask treatment similar to that which has been granted the settlers in Manitoba, and also at Prince Albert in the North-West. This treatment had been granted to the settlers on the South Saskatchewan in the river lot survey of the Parish of St. Laurent. Some considerable delay in granting entry occurred owing to "One Arrow's" Indian Reserve coming so close to the river that many of the lots could not have their two miles, which the settlers insisted on having. To this the consent of the Indians had first to be obtained and the necessary change in the survey effected and the plans prepared, so that it was not till November, 1884, that the office was in a position to grant entry.

Along the South Saskatchewan, outside the Parish of St. Laurent, prior to the survey, there were only seventeen families settled, and they extended along 60 miles of the banks of the river (counting both banks). The contention that the expense of a survey into river lots of that area should have been made to suit that number of settlers is absurd. Further, there is yet no evidence to show that such a survey was desired, in fact the actions of the majority would indicate the contrary. Every one of them could have obtained entry by a quarter or half of a half-section, covering all their improvements, without interfering with the claims of others. The lists show who those seventeen were.