

method dispose of the matter. He ought to institute a full investigation, and if the statement is correct, the man who dispenses the patronage ought not to be permitted to exercise that power any longer.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Richmond has promised to give me the name confidentially. As soon as he does so I will have an investigation made in regard to the matter, treating the information furnished me by the hon. member as confidential.

Mr. KYTE: Now that the minister is in a penitent mood—I do not mean as regards any misdeeds committed by himself, but as regards misdeeds committed by his predecessors—will he give me a little more frank information in regard to the last question I asked? I asked if the services of a certain censor had been dispensed with, and, if so, for what reason? The answer given is: "To promote the efficiency of the service." That means something or it means nothing. If his services have been dispensed with in order to promote the efficiency of the service, the minister ought to be in a position to tell me frankly in what respect this man's services have been inefficient. I do not ask him to reply in the House so that the matter will be put on record, but I would like if he would show his good faith and determination to deal fairly with these matters in the future by telling me confidentially what the actual reasons for dismissal were, and what he means by this reply. If there is anything to the discredit of this gentleman, I do not want to have it appear on Hansard, because that would not be fair to him, but under all the circumstances, the minister ought to give me privately the information for which I am asking.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Was that question asked to-day?

Mr. KYTE: It was answered to-day.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The matter to which my hon. friend refers is the answer given to the department by the chief censor. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. KYTE: The answer is signed by the deputy minister.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It was referred to him by the chief censor. That is the chief censor's answer to the deputy minister. The chief censor is a responsible officer. I should be surprised if he would make a reply that was untrue.

Mr. KYTE: I quite appreciate the fact that the minister would not have the correct information at the present time. Probably the chief censor would not feel justified in giving me what he might regard as confidential information, but the minister and I have discussed this matter with the common object of improving the conditions I am complaining of, and I ask if he will get the information from the chief censor and give it to me privately later on.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Richmond, as a responsible member of this House, has made certain statements here. I have told him, as far as one matter is concerned, that I will investigate it. I will also look into this matter; but so far as giving private information is concerned, I shall have to consider what course I shall take after investigation is made.

Mr. KYTE: Is the minister not prepared to give me any fuller information in regard to my question?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I did not say that; I said that I would look into the matter of which the hon. member complains.

Mr. KYTE: I trust I shall not be obliged to change the very good opinion which I had of the minister and which I expressed a few moments ago.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I can guarantee that my hon. friend will have no reason to change his opinion regarding myself.

Mr. KYTE: I trust I shall receive from the minister further proof of his determination to improve the conditions I have mentioned and to deal frankly with any member of this House who has an honest determination to assist him in improving those conditions.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to bring to the attention of the minister a memorandum transmitted to me by the hon. A. C. Rutherford, Director of National Service for northern Alberta. He encloses a copy of a report made by a gentleman in Edmonton who was appointed by a committee of citizens to make a report. It is in regard to the needs of the families of soldiers who have been either disabled or killed. It appears that there is found to exist a somewhat serious condition amongst those families, either by reason of the inadequacy of the pension or in its terms being inapplicable to the cases. I noticed in a newspaper a few days ago that a poor woman, whose husband had been killed and who has several children, had been brought