

KITSILANO INDIAN RESERVE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to ask one or two questions of the government, based upon a very important despatch which I see in the press. I must apologize for not having notified the minister, but I think he will be able to answer the question without the usual courtesy of a notice. The despatch is from Victoria and, in part, reads:

The Vancouver Harbour Board in future will control the Kitsilano Indian reserve, announced Hon. J. D. MacLean, Acting Premier. A telegram was received from Premier Oliver at Ottawa advising acceptance of the sum of \$500,000 for the property and the Executive Council ratified the agreement.

And then it says further—I do not wish to read more—that an unstated amount over the half million will go to the Indian fund, the province retaining the customary reversionary rights. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior: Has the transfer been agreed to as indicated in this despatch; is the sum of \$500,000 correctly quoted; what is the amount to go to the Indians, referred to in the despatch; does the arrangement allow to the province its contention for reversionary rights?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil), (Minister of the Interior): That is a very difficult question for one to answer from memory. All the despatch indicates that is new in the matter is that when Mr. Oliver was here I succeeded in getting him to agree to accept \$500,000 as the amount claimed by the province in the settlement of this dispute. True, the harbour board are desirous of obtaining the reserve. I have just forgotten the sequence in which this thing runs, but at all events there was an arbitration the terms of which the federal government refused to accept. No price has yet been fixed as the amount that the harbour board would pay for the island. But the \$500,000 mentioned in the despatch is the amount that the provincial government, as announced by the premier, would be willing to accept as settlement of their interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that mean that they get \$500,000 for their alleged reversionary interest?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not mean they get anything. That is their own proposal; there has been no acceptance of it.

Mr. STEVENS: Then the despatch is not correct in saying that there has been accept-

ance of the sum of \$500,000 for the property, and ratification of the agreement by the Executive Council.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will try to give the information, but this whole question involves a considerable amount of detail.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps my hon. friend will give it to-morrow—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. STEVENS: —because it is a very important question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might say for my hon. friend's information that no further progress has been made with the settlement than that one statement from the provincial government that they would be willing to accept \$500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just to clear up one point that the minister attempted to answer to-day, and which I did not understand: he said that the government had prevailed on Mr. Oliver to accept the \$500,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought that was my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If I left that impression on my right hon friend's mind, I did not intend to do so. That was their own suggestion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government have not accepted that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, we have not accepted anything. We are trying to settle it.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 18, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 19, respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.—Mr. Jacobs.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHS

Mr. SALES:

1. What is the number of miles of telegraph lines between Fort Qu'Appelle and Humboldt, and between Humboldt and Battleford?

2. What is the number of telegraph stations maintained on these lines?

3. What is the cost of maintenance, exclusive of salaries, of these stations?