

What caused Mr. Graham to change his mind between the time he wrote the original letter and this later date is hard for one to understand. The other letters are not material to the point I wish to discuss; there was considerable correspondence between the village of Pelly and the department with regard to this roadway through the land to their recreation grounds on the shore of the lake.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Will it shorten the discussion if I say to my hon. friend now that any promise which has been made by the department with respect to that road will be carried out? I judge from my hon. friend's statement that the department committed itself to a road; the road was surveyed and in the meantime the sale took place, and now the village is being asked to pay for that road. On behalf of the department I will say to my hon. friend that I will see to it that the promises contained in the correspondence are carried out by the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am glad to have that statement from the minister; it will shorten the discussion very considerably. In the meantime, however, there has been a long delay and the village not only had to settle with the department according to the original agreement but now they are obliged to settle with the new purchaser, and it has cost them considerably more than it should.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The correspondence must indicate that the road was to be granted before the survey took place; I suppose that is the fact. I want to make it quite clear that however the department obligated itself with regard to that road, that obligation will be carried out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I appreciate that, and I am only sorry the minister could not carry out the other promises of his department.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not dealing with that at the moment; I thought I could shorten the discussion in this way.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It will shorten the discussion very materially, because there are about a dozen letters it will not be necessary to read. However, there is one letter I should like to read, written from the village of Pelly to the Department of Indian Affairs, Ottawa, under date of May 9, 1929:

It seems that we are never going to get cleared up in this matter, and I feel that most of the difficulty is due to the action of your department. You instructed us to go ahead and have the survey made for the road across section 26, then you disposed of the land without

reservation of this road and consequently threw us in considerable trouble and expense. When a committee of people are endeavouring to act in the public interest in obtaining facilities for a summer resort, and doing the work entirely gratis, at considerable trouble to themselves and also some expense, we feel that we should be assisted instead of hindered by a department of the Dominion government. If you will look up your file in connection with the sale of section 26-32-32-W1st, you will see that I made enquiry about it and you informed me that it was being used by the Indian people for pasture and it was not for sale, but when it was to be offered for sale I would receive notification about it. The next thing I heard it was sold to MacKay of Verigin. This does not seem a very fair deal either.

We were proceeding to take expropriation steps in the matter of this road, then came a letter from the Department of Highways informing us that your department had written asking for the ten dollars per acre and that you would issue the transfer for this road. We stopped the expropriation proceedings and sent in the \$10 per acre. Now after three or four months we get word from the Department of Highways that you have the money and that we are still to reckon with MacKay for his equity. I think a situation like this absurd and that your department has certainly been very unfair. Here it is spring again and we are still held up in the use of this road. It is very discouraging and I certainly think your department should take some steps to assist us out of the difficulty that you have got us into. Kindly let us know the price paid for this property by MacKay, so that we may have some idea of what he may be entitled to over and above the \$10 per acre. Trusting you may be able to get this matter straightened out.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) J. M. Telford.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I shall make my answer as brief as possible; I will not need to deal with the question of the road, since I have already answered my hon. friend on that point. First let me say that this dispute with regard to the road was first brought to my attention by my hon. friend; evidently the negotiations have been carried on in the department. I just want to reassure him that whatever the department agreed with the village of Pelly to do will be carried out, regardless of the fact that the sale has taken place.

With regard to the sale itself, there have been one or two instances of this kind recently; there is one pending now, and I have decided that for the future the same system which prevails in the sale of Dominion lands will prevail in these cases, that is, by public auction after being advertised for a considerable period. I am bound to say that the statements made by my hon. friend and the letters he has read with regard to the situation up to 1926 are correct. I remember the circumstances very well, but from 1926 on I had not heard of the matter until my hon.