in question. The postmaster having taken exception to this finding, the matter was referred to Controller Armstrong and Inspector Henderson, two experienced and reliable officers, who personally attended at St. Thomas and conducted a thorough and careful examination, under oath, and who also personally investigated the books and affairs of the office. They concur in the finding of Mr. Bennett in so far as that officer reported the postmaster as guilty of negligence in not having two wickets kept open, and the public properly attended to; and in not promoting greater activity on the part of the staff; but, they report the rest of the work in that office as being very well performed. They did not concur with Mr. Bennett's finding that the postmaster was indolent or incompetent, or entirely to blame for the state of affairs; and expressed the view that the postmaster is not indolent or incompetent, and was not wholly to blame for the state of affairs complained of; and they further expressed the opinion that one of the officers, who received com-plaints from the public as to the unnecessary delay in the service, failed to inform the postmaster of such complaints, or to take any means to remedy the same, and was disloyal to the postmaster and to the public. They found the books kept in a neat and careful manner, and that the reports of errors on file at Ottawa and in the office of the post office inspector and of the superintendent of the railway mail service were comparatively few, and that any irregularities which occurred were of a trifling character; and that apart from the complaints made as to the want of accommodation at the general delivery wicket. the work of the office upon the whole appeared to have been conducted in a satisfactory manner. In view of the conclusions of Messrs. Armstrong and Henderson. that the postmaster was not indolent or incompetent, and was not entirely to blame for the state of affairs, that he had not received loyal services from one of his staff. and that the work of that office, upon the whole appeared to have been conducted in a satisfactory manner, I came to the conclusion that the public interest did not call for the dismissal of the postmaster, but that his suspension and the anxiety to himself that must have been consequent thereon was a sufficient mark of the department's disapproval of his shortcomings, and suffi-cient punishment therefor, and would, in all probability. effectually prevent any such further grounds for complaint. Accordingly, I directed his reinstatement.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. minister has not answered the second paragraph of the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My attention had not been called to that. I can only say, from memory, that I had the advantage of a number of delegations upon Hertford College, Oxford), special commis-

the subject, pressing upon me to reinstate the officer pending inquiry. This I refused to do, but allowed him to remain under suspension until the merits of his case had been finally determined upon. That is the substance of what passed at the interviews, but if I find myself in error my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) will permit me to supplement this answer.

PAYMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

What sums have been paid out of the consolidated revenues of the Dominion since July 1, 1897, in connection with the Alien Labour

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatirck). Amounts paid in connection with the Alien Labour Act from July 1, 1897, to May, 25, 1900, by Department of Justice:

1897-8.

T. G. Mathers, Winnipeg	\$114	00		
_	·		114	00
1898-9.		•		•
T. D. Cowper, Welland	\$168	99		
R. Rush, Sault Ste. Marie	- 18	00		
	219			
W. B. McMurrich, Toronto	371			
	192			
F. C. McBurney, Niagara Falls	122			
1. C. McDulliey, Magala Palis.	144		1.093	20
			1,033	00
1899-1900, to date.				
W. Keys, Montreal	\$405	00		
W. B. McMurrich, Toronto				
			428	02
			720	02
• Total				-
• Total		\$		-
• Total		\$		-
				-
1897-8. Paid by Department of the Int		:		-
1897-8. Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod	erior \$204	: 00		-
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge	erior \$204 99	: 00 00		-
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur	erior \$204 99 313	00 00 45		-
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg	erior \$204 99 313 107	: 00 00 45 22		-
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg C. C. Stewart, Emerson	erior \$204 99 313 107 103	00 00 45 22 00		-
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg	erior \$204 99 313 107 103	00 00 45 22 00	1,635	40
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg C. C. Stewart, Emerson	erior \$204 99 313 107 103	00 00 45 22 00		40
Paid by Department of the Int W. H. Eaton, McLeod J. Flanagan, Lethbridge R. W. Martin, Port Arthur W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg C. C. Stewart, Emerson	erior \$204 99 313 107 103 94	00 00 45 22 00 20	1,635 920	40

AN ENGLISH EXPERT ON THEKLONDIKE.

HIBBERT TUPPER Sir CHARLES asked:

- 1. Did the government purchase any copies, and if so, how many, of a pamphlet published by A. N. E. Treadgold, M.A., entitled 'An English Report on the Klondike'?

 2. If such purchase was made, how much has
- been paid for it?
- 3. If the purchase was made, when was it made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. The government purchased from G. N. Morang Company (Limited), of Toronto, 665 copies of a pamphlet published by that company, entitled

Mr. MULOCK.