

warding it to its destination according to the address, even though a request to such effect be written thereon.

SUBSIDY TO REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked :

1. What amount of cash subsidy did the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company receive from the Dominion Government?

2. What amount of lands did they receive per mile?

3. Are the lands located, and if so, where?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The company do not receive any direct cash subsidy from the Government. All they get is a bonus of \$80,000 a year for twenty years contingent on the transportation of men and supplies. The land subsidies are 6,400 acres per mile.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Is the Government aware that, speaking at a public meeting in the city of Quebec, on the 27th of April instant, Mr. S. N. Parent, Mayor of Quebec made the following statement, according to the newspaper "Le Soleil" :—"He (Mr. Parent) held in his hand a letter from Ottawa, giving him the assurance that the building of the bridge (meaning the bridge across the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec) would soon begin" ?

2. Has the Government, or any of the members thereof, given Mr. Parent any such assurance?

3. Since the Premier announced the policy of the Government in reference to the bridge across the St. Lawrence, at or near Quebec, on the 9th of September, 1896, in reply to the inquiry by the member for Montmagny, has the Government in any way altered its policy in relation to the said enterprise, and if so, in what way?

4. Have any assurances, other than those already stated, been given in relation to the said bridge to anybody, and if so, what were the assurances?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government are not aware that Mr. Parent made the statement referred to and reported in the newspaper "Le Soleil." There is no change of policy with regard to the bridge, and the Government have taken no steps since the answer given to this House by myself on the 9th of September, 1896.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman has not answered the second paragraph of the question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am not aware that Mr. Parent has any such letter.

GEORGE VEZINA.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Is it not a fact that the present Controller of Inland Revenue gave orders to have George Vézina, of Quebec, imprisoned under conviction of having infringed the Inland Revenue laws?

2. If he did not, why did he not give the necessary instructions to carry out the sentence of the court?

3. If he did give instructions, why were they not carried out?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). When the present Government came into office they found the case had been disposed of by their predecessors in office and they did not deem it at all advisable to disturb the disposition of that case.

LAND OFFICE AT ESTEVAN.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. Whether the land office at Estevan has been removed to Alameda?

2. Whether any change has been made in the boundary of the agency?

3. Were the services of Mr. A. E. Hetherington dispensed with?

4. If so, why? Was there any complaint against his efficiency?

5. Has his position been given to Mr. D. A. McEwan?

6. What training or experience has D. A. McEwan had?

7. If the position has been given to McEwan, why was it not given to an official already in the service?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. The land office at Estevan has been closed. A new office for the district has been established at Alameda. 2. No. 3. Yes. 4. When the office at Estevan was discontinued the Minister decided not to re-employ Mr. Hetherington, for reasons which he considered to be satisfactory and conducive to the public interest. Mr. Hetherington had only been employed by the Department for a few years. 5. Yes. 6. Mr. McEwan's training and experience were of a character to satisfy the Minister that Mr. McEwan had the ability to perform the duties of the office satisfactorily. 7. Because the Minister thought Mr. McEwan the best qualified man for the position.

MR. PIERRE BÉGIN'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Has Pierre Bégin, of Lévis, been dismissed from the position of section man on the Intercolonial Railway?

2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?

3. Was an investigation held in his case? If so, what is the nature of the report, and by whom was it made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Pierre Bégin has been dismissed from the position referred to. He was dismissed for active and offensive partisanship in the last general election. No investigation was held, the department having acted on the representation of Dr. Guay, M.P., made on personal knowledge.