

EXPENDITURE ON DESCHAMBAULT WHARF.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired :

When does the government think it will be able to lay on the table of this House the following documents, the production of which was ordered during the present session, at the dates mentioned:

(a) The statement indicating the amounts spent on the Deschambault wharf—February 4?

(b) The correspondence exchanged between the Department of Militia and Lieutenant Colonel Davidson re the latter's dismissal and the promotion of Sir Henry Pellatt to the rank of colonel—February 14?

(c) The statement showing what was the daily pay of the soldiers of the company No. 2 of the Ottawa Field Battery in 1865 and 1866—March 17?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The answers are :

Deschambault, Quebec—Statement of expenditure of this department since May 1, 1904.

Amount of contract for construction of wharf.. . . .	\$15,840 00
Amount of extras.. . . .	159 75
	<hr/>
	\$15,999 75
Inspector's wages, advertising, &c.. . . .	729 53
	<hr/>
Total construction of wharf.. . . .	\$16,729 28
Fenders added by department.. . . .	175 14
Legal services re purchase of site.. . . .	25 00
Placing trestle roadway.. . . .	495 22
Removal of rocks from approach by water.. . . .	2,314 23
Building approach by land.. . . .	\$4,393 64
Purchase of right of way.. . . .	326 17
	<hr/>
	4,719 81
Building waiting room, &c.. . . .	1,030 25
	<hr/>
	\$25,489 93

PROROGATION.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, may I ask if prorogation is about to take place to-day? I notice by the morning press that it will be inconvenient for His Excellency or the deputy to attend.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I was asked by my hon. friend from Wolseley last night as to the prorogation. At that time I understood His Excellency intended to be here this morning, and that if we could close matters we could have him prorogue. But it appears afterwards he sent a further telegram to the premier that he would be unable to be here. The deputy governor had been communicated with on Friday, requesting that in the event of

anything happening to prevent His Excellency attending, he should attend to prorogue parliament, but as he had an important engagement, he was unable to leave Quebec in time to reach Ottawa for prorogation to-day.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It must have been a very serious engagement indeed that would prevent the deputy of His Excellency from attending to prorogue parliament. I am glad to have the assurance that the deputy will be here Monday.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is there anything paid to the deputy for his attendance?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No. Except when His Excellency is absent. Under the rule, when His Excellency was abroad in former years the representative was entitled to one-third, I think it was, or one-fourth of the salary. That was the rule up till, I suppose, three years ago, when some remonstrance was made that that sum seemed unreasonable to deduct from the salary of the Governor General of Canada, and a correspondence took place with the colonial office, which resulted in the allowance to the deputy being cut down, but I do not know to what figure. But it allowed a wide margin to the Governor General, I think thirty days, without the representative or deputy being entitled to anything. Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick had, on that occasion, however rendered very efficient service, and receive a certain amount as compensation.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Besides the \$1,000 paid two years ago, last year he received payment again—

'Unforeseen expenses, Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, expenses when acting Governor General, \$500.'

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I thought the last payment was \$1,000.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose the date of prorogation of parliament was unforeseen by him. Will he be paid for that?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Those payments are not made as a matter of right. Sometimes where he has been inconvenienced and has