

PRE-EMPTIONS AND HOMESTEADS—
ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What was the total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads sold in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, from the 1st November, 1909, to the 31st December, 1909?
2. What total amount of money receivable by the government does this represent in each province?
3. How much has been received by the government on account of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads in each of the provinces from the date of the passing of the Dominion Lands Act, 1908, to the 31st December, 1909?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Alberta, 153,600 acres; Saskatchewan, 287,360.
2. Alberta, \$460,800; Saskatchewan, \$862,080; exclusive of interest and entry fees.
3. Alberta, payments on pre-emptions, \$50,114.75; payments on purchased homesteads, \$82,515.30; Saskatchewan, payments on pre-emptions, \$71,838.96; payments on purchased homesteads, \$208,618.96.

Exclusive of entry fees (these figures show an increase over those furnished on the 18th January, in answer to Mr. Foster's question of that date, which is accounted for by the fact that the complete returns for the month of December, 1909, had not reached the accounts branch when the answer to Mr. Foster's question was prepared).

BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BILL—
TITLE TO STREAMS.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government leased to any person the right to take gravel from lot 379, on Coquitlam river, at New Westminster Junction, British Columbia? If so, to whom, for what period and on what terms?
2. Does the government claim title to the beds of non-tidal and non-navigable, except for canoes, streams in the railway belt of British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No.
2. The government is advised that so far as the beds and banks of rivers in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia are Crown property, they are Dominion lands, and may be administered by the Department of Interior.

POST OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Is the post office at New Westminster about to be placed on the basis of a city office, with appointments to the staff directly from the government rather than from the postmaster?

2. If so, to whom should applications for employment be addressed, and what endorsement is required to secure consideration by the department?

Mr. FIELDING.

ment is required to secure consideration by the department?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. and 2. No. The office is, however, being changed to a semi-staff basis by which the salaries of the clerks will be paid by the department direct. Applications for employment should be addressed to the Postmaster General. The endorsement required is qualification and ability to do the work of the office.

STANLEY BARRACKS.

Mr. WALLACE:

If the Baby farm is to be sold, is it the intention of the government to buy other property in or near the city of Toronto on which to build a new barracks in place of Stanley barracks?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

SOUTH AFRICAN PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. WALLACE:

1. Has the government any control of the South African Patriotic Fund? If not, who has?

2. Have any complaints been made to the government that certain persons who are entitled to receive benefit from the fund, have not received any consideration?

3. Has the government any knowledge of how much was paid into this fund?

4. What persons have received benefit from this fund, and what amount in each case?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) No. (b) It is controlled by the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The government has no information on this point.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada. He said: When, three weeks ago, I had the honour of presenting this Bill to the House, I entertained the hope that by this time my hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr Brodeur), would be sufficiently restored to health to permit him to undertake the duty which now devolves upon me. To my deep regret, this hope has not been fulfilled. It is the misfortune of the House that it has to be deprived of the wealth of information, attention and care which had been accumulated by my hon. colleague in the preparation of this measure and for the exposition of the policy of which it is the expression, from its basic principle to the minutest detail. Perhaps the House will agree with me at the outset that it would not be amiss to cast a retrospective glance