

never intended to have that sum reimbursed by the Seminary, either directly or indirectly, either by money, or by the building of a certain number of log-houses. It was a purchase pure and simple, the purpose of which was to relieve the Seminary by so much, in consideration of the enormous sacrifices already made by that Corporation.

Let us see again on this point the memorial already quoted of the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, dated Oct. 21, 1882 :—

“ In fact it was so little the intention of your Government to have any portion of that money (\$5,000) reimbursed by the Seminary, either directly or indirectly, either by money or by building an equal number of log-houses, that the Order-in-Council which authorized the payment of the \$5,000, and put the condition of its payment and voting by Parliament, distinctly says how the Government will be reimbursed, the last words of the Order-in-Council saying that said sum shall be a second charge upon the Reserve of Gibson, after the Seminary will have been paid of the money by them laid out for the purchase of the 25,000 acres of land.”

Consequently, in the eyes of the Government, as well as in equity and justice, we are not obliged to undertake fresh expenses for the houses of the Indians who are the occupants of the squatters' lands.

The second complaint expressed in the letter of Sept. 12th, 1884, is, therefore, as unfounded as the first. We therefore consider that Mr. Vankoughnet's two letters are thus fully refuted.