

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). It is the intention of the Government to allow British Columbia fishermen to fish with traps in the same manner in Canadian waters as they were used last year. As there has been a good deal of controversy on this matter, I may say to my hon. friend that I declined to allow additional fish traps to be used in Boundary Bay, for this reason, that when I had the honour of visiting British Columbia last year I promised the fishermen and the packers that I would make no material alteration in the fishing regulations of that great province until Commissioner Prince had visited it and had reported to me upon the fishery conditions, and whether I would be justified in allowing further traps. I may say that Commissioner Prince has instructions to proceed at an early day to British Columbia, and to spend a long time there, and thoroughly to master the fishery conditions.

POSTMASTER, NORTHFIELD, B.C.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General to an answer that he gave me yesterday, and that I may put myself in order I will conclude with a motion. I will read the record from the "Hansard":

Mr. DAVIN asked:

"Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?"

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster in question was dismissed because of the overbearing conduct of the postmaster and her husband towards many persons who were obliged to visit the post office.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my hon. friend's (Mr. Mulock's) attention to the question, which is:

"Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?"

Her husband is not now living. I would ask an answer to the question.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I have given the answer.

Mr. DAVIN. Has her husband been overbearing since he died?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The term "postmaster" is applied to the occupant of the office, whether male or female. In this case the postmaster was Mrs. McManus. Her husband is living. The report of the inspector was to the effect that they had both been overbearing in their demeanour to many persons who had occasion to visit the office.

Well, Sir, I think it would be a matter of great gratification to Mrs. McManus to be assured, on the high authority of my hon. friend, that her husband is living. He died in February last, he was buried three days afterwards, and I have not heard of any resurrection miracle having been per-

formed. I have a letter here from that poor widow that I will read to the House:

Northfield, B.C., 11th March, 1897.

Dear Mr. Davin,—I don't like to trouble you with my misfortunes, but, under the circumstances, I think it right to ask your influence on my behalf. I have been for nearly three years postmistress here, and I believe I have carried out my duties to the entire satisfaction of the department. I was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Haslam, the then member for Nanaimo. I had a great deal of trouble with the unruly element here, and had to prosecute one man for assaulting me in my office, and had him convicted and fined, and the expense of this was borne by me. On the 19th of November my husband, whom you knew at Qu'Appelle, and who was my mail carrier, met with an accident while carrying the mails, from the effects of which he died on the 12th of last month.

That is the 12th of February. She goes on to say:

I do think it is hard for a poor widow who has lost her husband, for the postal service to supersede her in this manner. It reflects little credit on a Liberal or any other government. I have petitioned the Postmaster General for compensation for the loss of my husband.

The petition did not evidently make much impression on my hon. friend, because, up to yesterday, he was under the impression, and made the confident statement, that the man was alive.

You are well aware of the services that my husband rendered in the North-west Territories—

That is, during the rebellion of 1885:

—for which services he received no reward. I need hardly tell you that my husband's long illness and death has left me in very straitened circumstances, and that I feel keenly the way that I have been treated by the Government.

Now, Sir, I knew Mr. McManus when he kept an hotel at Qu'Appelle station. He was a man who had served Her Majesty, who had seen service, who had fought for the Empire; and I will say of him that a more gallant man and a more obliging man did not walk the earth than that same McManus. In 1885 when the flag of rebellion was lifted up in the North-west Territories, he rendered signal service. Sir, I think these are things that a Government should remember, especially a Government whose bosom is swelling with great British enthusiasm, whose bosom is almost incapable of holding the new flood of loyalty that has poured into it. I think it is extraordinary of them to do as they have done. Surely the facts that this man has served his country, has worn Her Majesty's uniform, and has served this Government during the rebellion of 1885, are matters to be considered. But there is another thing to be considered, the fact that this man is dead, and that this poor widow is left without her protector and her provider. I think that mere chivalry—I will not speak of his conduct as unchivalrous—but surely the commonest humanity would