

farmer, of Ste. Anne de Sorel, for the performance of the said works? If so, what were the terms thereof?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The Department of Public Works has no knowledge of there being any balances due to the persons named by the hon. member. Mr. Berlinguet has not sent any account. The Department of Public Works has no knowledge of any sums of money having been paid to Charles Mongeau, Napoleon Mongeau and Maurice Mongeau. On the 10th of January, 1892, a cheque was issued to the order of Dolphis Millette for the sum of \$162 for stone delivered at the Yamaska dam. There is no contract between the Government and Mr. Moise Lesperance.

#### TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Mulock) asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to a statement which recently appeared in portions of the press to the effect that certain cattle alleged to be suffering from tuberculosis were, on or about the 17th of February instant, slaughtered at Toronto by order of the health officer of that city? If so, what steps, if any, have the Government taken and when, in order to ascertain whether said cattle were actually affected with tuberculosis?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has not been informed respecting the allegation in the question relating to the slaughter of cattle on the 17th instant at Toronto, affected by tuberculosis. The Government has not up to the present caused the provisions of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act to be applied to the disease of tuberculosis among cattle.

#### DISCHARGE OF CONSTABLE GIBEAULT.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. What are the reasons which led to the discharge of Constable Gibeault of the Dominion Police? 2. Was a sworn inquiry demanded by Constable Gibeault, in relation to his dismissal? 3. If so, was it granted; and if not, why not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This constable was fined for deserting his post while on duty. He retaliated by making charges against his superior officer, principally of fanaticism and partiality, which appeared on investigation to be quite unfounded. These charges were preferred in the first instance by the constable in consequence of this fine, and he requested permission to withdraw the objectionable terms in which they were stated, alleging that his letter containing the charges had been written by another for him, and that being unable to read or write he was not aware of the nature of the language which it contained. Having withdrawn the objectionable language in the charges, the charges themselves were investigated on the 6th of February, 1892, by the

Deputy Minister of Justice, who reported that Gibeault had failed to substantiate them. Subsequently, on the 4th of May, 1892, he repeated the charges in the same terms as those in which they were originally stated, and asked for a further investigation. The matter was again investigated by an officer of the Department of Justice, and before the investigation was concluded the constable proposed, through his counsel, to withdraw the charges on condition of his being reinstated in his office, he having been in the meantime suspended. That was declined, and the investigation was proceeded with. After hearing all the parties concerned and their witnesses, the officer reported that the plaintiff had entirely failed to substantiate his charges. On both occasions, Gibeault was represented by counsel; and the latter practically abandoned the charge of fanaticism. It was not deemed necessary to have a sworn inquiry on statements not made under oath. Mr. Gibeault's charges appear not to have been well founded.

J. J. DAVIDSON.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, When was J. J. Davidson appointed dry goods appraiser at Montreal? What was his salary at time of appointment? Has he been transferred from Montreal to Toronto, and for what reason? Has a person named Cuthbert, of Toronto, been appointed dry goods appraiser for Montreal, and what duties is he discharging there? Has there been a young man of the name of Lavoie appointed assistant appraiser in the dry goods department in the Custom-house, Montreal? What is his salary? Has he had experience? Is he a son of one of the collectors? What experience has he had, and is he the same person who made in 1891-92, out of Customs seizures, \$287.85?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. J. J. Davidson was appointed dry goods appraiser at Montreal the 1st of December, 1891. His salary at the time of appointment was \$1,400 per annum; he was transferred from Montreal to Toronto because an experienced man was required to take the place of dry goods appraiser Sargeant (resigned). A person named Cuthbert, of Toronto, was not appointed dry goods appraiser for Montreal, but is now acting assistant appraiser at Montreal. A young man named Lavoie was appointed assistant appraiser in the dry goods department in the Custom-house at Montreal, at a salary of \$800 per annum; he has had experience; he is not the son of one of the collectors; there is no collector at present at that port. He has had experience since 1885 in the dry goods appraiser's department, and is the same person who received in 1891-92, out of Customs seizures, the sum of \$287.85.

#### SOUTH MIDDLESEX.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the vacancy in the