

Mr. SPENCE (Parkdale):

1. Having reference to the investigation into the wholesale fruit and vegetable business under the Combines Investigation Act in the province of Ontario, what time elapsed between the filing of the original application and the presentation of the report of Major Lewis Duncan?
2. What was the total cost of the said investigation?
3. What amount was paid in salary and fees to the said Major Lewis Duncan for this investigation?
4. What amount was paid as expenses?
5. What is the total amount paid to date for this and other investigations to the said Major Lewis Duncan, (a) as fees, and (b) as expenses?
6. Is the said Major Lewis Duncan still retained or employed as a commissioner under the Combines Investigation Act?

Hon. Mr. RINFRET:

1. Fifteen months.
2. \$14,111.00.
3. \$5,581.
4. \$91.85.
5. (a) \$26,855; (b) \$5,583.94.
6. No.

## EMPIRE SETTLEMENT SCHEME

Mr. BOULANGER:

What amounts have been paid up to date by the Government in pursuance of what is known as the Empire Settlement scheme or other similar schemes, for transportation, assistance, loans, etc., (a) to immigrants themselves; (b) to the Salvation Army; (c) to Canadian or foreign colonization societies and agencies?

Hon. Mr. FORKE:

Including expenses from the inception of the Empire Settlement scheme to January 31, 1927, the following amounts have been paid:—

Passage loans	\$ 474,930 00
Passage grants	667,081 41
Other expenses not recoverable	4,867 08
	<b>\$1,146,877 50</b>

- (a) Nothing as far as the Department of Immigration and Colonization is concerned.
- (b) Transportation loans, \$18,912.03; transportation grants, \$61,480.77.
- (c) Transportation grants, \$167,244.70; assistance, \$25,481.57.

The figures in (b) and (c) are included in the total of \$1,146,877.50.

## ALLEGED POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP—EMPLOYEES IN LEMING COUNTY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Have charges of political partisanship been made against any government employees in the county of Leeds, Ontario?
2. What is the name or names of the party or parties making such charges?
3. Have such charges been made in writing?
4. Has one Arthur G. Parish been appointed or authorized to investigate such charges?
5. Will the parties charged be allowed to have counsel on such investigation?
6. Will the commissioner take a shorthand record of the evidence and proceedings?
7. Is it the intention of the government to dismiss any employees who may be found by said commissioner to have been guilty of political partisanship?

Hon. Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.
- 2 and 3. No information.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
- 6 and 7. No information.

## BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS—COMPENSATION

Mr. LUCAS:

1. In what year were the first cattle slaughtered in Canada for bovine tuberculosis?
2. What total number of cattle have been slaughtered in Canada for bovine tuberculosis to December 31, 1926?
3. What total amount of compensation has been paid for cattle slaughtered in Canada for bovine tuberculosis to December 31, 1926?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. The first cattle destroyed in Canada for tuberculosis by the Dominion Department of Agriculture were slaughtered in the fiscal year 1915-16.
2. By the Dominion Department of Agriculture, 73,609.
3. \$4,190,574.51.

## OVERSEA SETTLEMENT—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. TOLMIE:

1. During the summer of 1926, did the Department of Immigration and Colonization conduct the Earl of Clarendon, chairman of the overseas settlement committee, and Mr. T. C. Macnaughton, vice-chairman, on a trip inspecting British family settlement and future settlement opportunities in Canada?
2. Was the province of British Columbia visited?
3. If so, what districts were covered?
4. What opinions, if any, were expressed by the British visitors as to the settlement opportunities in British Columbia?
5. Have any agreements been negotiated providing for cooperation in settlement between the Dominion and provincial governments in Canada, and the overseas settlement committee jointly?
6. Are any such agreements in process of negotiation?
7. In any such agreements either negotiated or under consideration, has the government of the province of British Columbia participated in any way?
8. Has the government of the province of British Columbia submitted to the Dominion government any definite proposals as a basis for such settlement agreements?
9. Certain large tracts of lands in British Columbia are owned as the Fleming family's holding at Salmon River, near Prince George. Lord Exeter's holding near Exeter on the P.C. & E. railway. Has the British Columbia government, or the Dominion government, made any proposals for the settlement of these lands?
10. Was the Dominion government instrumental in bringing a number of Estonian families under Sir John Pitsa to Canada in 1924? If so, were these people settled in the Stewart Lake district, British Columbia? Were they settled under provincial or Dominion auspices? Has the settlement been successful?
11. Has a property known as the Amiens farm in the Fraser valley, near Matsqui, British Columbia, been sub-divided for the settlement of British families? If so, how many families have been settled? What type of family was selected for this settlement? Has this settlement been successful to date?

Hon. Mr. FORKE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The overseas settlement committee party was taken by motor car from Sicamous south through Okanagan district, touching Enderby, Armstrong, Vernon, Kelowna, Summerland and Penticton. The party then went by rail to Vancouver. Two days were spent in motor trips to farms and settlers in the Fraser valley, after which the Courtenay and Victoria districts on Vancouver island were covered by motor car. The party then travelled over the P. and G. E. railway from Squamish to Exeter and from thence by motor car along the Cariboo trail to Quesnel and Prince George with a further day's motoring in the Buckley valley near Smithers and Telkwa. Altogether the party were motored over 1,200 miles in British Columbia, and they visited nearly 60 British families on the land.
4. The British visitors were of the opinion that the province of British Columbia offered excellent opportunities for the assisted settlement of British people. They were particularly impressed with the settlement opportunities along the Canadian National Prince Rupert line.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes; correspondence is now in progress.
8. Answered by No. 7.
9. No.
10. Sir John Pitsa, as a result of a trip made to Canada in the summer of 1923, brought a party of Estonians to Canada in 1924 and secured a location near Stewart Lake. The party was met at Halifax by land settlement officers and conducted through to Vanderhoof where they were turned over to the provincial government. The department has but meagre information as to the success of the colony but understands that progress is slow owing to the lack of capital. A number of new settlers have arrived since the first party of 1924.
11. The Amiens farm has been sub-divided and eleven families have been settled. Scotch dairy farmers were selected. The settlement thus far has given outstanding evidences of success.

## PAYMENTS BY BANKRUPT ESTATES

Mr. BOYS:

1. How many estates of bankrupts have paid fifty cents on the dollar or over?
2. How many have paid less than fifty cents?
3. How many bankrupts have received a discharge since the introduction of the act?

Hon. Mr. CANNON:

- 1, 2 and 3. The Minister of Justice has no information.

## REPORT OF HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. HANSON:

1. Is there now current a license to the Maine and New Brunswick Power Company to export hydro-electric power to the United States?
2. If so, when was such license first issued?
3. Is it the intention of the department concerned to continue the yearly export license to this company?
4. Is the government aware that the company in question, or interests closely allied to this company are at present promoting opposition to a measure in the Maine legislature looking to the creation of storage facilities for hydro-electric development in the province of New Brunswick, and in the light of such information is the department willing to renew the export license of this company?

Hon. Mr. MALCOLM:

1. Yes.
2. The current license was issued on April 14, 1926. The first license was issued on November 9, 1907.
3. The company's application is now under consideration by the government.
4. Representations have been received from the Prime Minister of New Brunswick, relative to the renewal of this export license. He requested that his representations be treated confidentially at present.

## DAIRY CATTLE IN CANADA

Mr. CAILEY:

1. What is the number of dairy cattle in Canada?
2. What proportion are pure bred?
3. What is the average yield of milk per cow if known?
4. What is the estimated cost to carry a cow for one year?
5. What is the probable value of her products for a year?
6. Has the government any policies in effect looking to the improving of this situation; if so, what are these policies?
7. How many inspectors are employed throughout Canada in R.O.P. work among dairy cattle?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the number of milch cows in Canada for 1926 was 3,951,335.
2. Approximately 1.7 per cent.
3. The annual production of the average dairy cows is estimated at 4,000 pounds; the average production of cows supervised under the cow testing system of the Dominion Live Stock branch for the last five years is 5,924 pounds milk—(eight months period); the average mature record of pure bred cows of the various breeds entered in the record of performance in 1925 was 11,175 pounds.
4. The feed cost of a dairy cow, as fed on the average farm, for one year would be between \$50 and \$60.
5. The average value of products per cow is approximately \$60 per annum, on the basis of \$1.50 per hundredweight for milk.
6. Yes. The Canadian record of performance system, under which production records of pure bred herds are supervised by the department. Inspectors visit the herds with reasonable frequency about eight times per year. The inspector stays for two days on each occasion; checks the weights recorded; makes the butter fat test for each cow entered, and reports milk yield recorded at the time of his visit in comparison with that recorded during the days immediately preceding. The herd owner obtains information of great value to him regarding the merits of all the cows in his herd as a result of these tests. The primary purpose of the work is to provide production credentials for the dams of dairy bulls, and under this system, a policy of advanced registration of dairy bulls based on the record of performance test is in operation.
7. At present the number of inspectors on the record of performance staff is 41, but the staff is being increased by ten additional inspectors.

## LEAMINGTON POSTMASTER

Mr. GOTT:

1. Has the Postmaster General recently dismissed or caused to be dismissed, Major W. G. Gidley, postmaster at Leamington, Ontario?
2. If so, what charges were preferred against him, and by whom?
3. Was he given any chance to defend himself of the charges made?
4. If it could be proven that the charges were false and without foundation, would the department consider reinstatement?
5. Is the appointment of his successor permanent?
6. Who was appointed in his stead, and on whose recommendation?
7. Has a petition reached the department protesting against his dismissal?
8. What salary was paid the former postmaster?
9. When was Major Gidley appointed?
10. Has proficiency at the Leamington post office been increased during his term of office?
11. What were the general reports on the work of the deposed official?
12. Was any investigation made locally at Leamington, or inquiry made following charges against Major Gidley, and if so, who advised and submitted reports on which the department saw fit to act?

Hon. Mr. VENIOT:

1. Yes.
2. A petition bearing 37 signatures was received complaining (a) of postmaster's refusal to distribute prepaid mail matter during last provincial election (b) of lack of courtesy towards public.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Temporary only—pending Civil Service Commission's selection.
6. Sam French, on the recommendation of the Postmaster General.
7. Yes.
8. Salary and allowance (1926-1927) \$6,224.74, out of which he pays his own staff.
9. 26th July, 1920.
- 10 and 11. Inspection of 29th May, 1924—post office rated very good. Inspection of 10th February, 1925—post office rated good. Inspection of 14th April, 1926—post office rated good.
12. Yes. Investigation made by local inspector and report submitted by district superintendent, London.

## HOME BANK LIQUIDATION

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many shareholders had the Home Bank when it went into liquidation?
2. How many of these met their double liability?
3. What was the aggregate par value of the total shares?
4. To what amount did the shareholders meet the double liability as called for under the Bank Act?
5. What expectation is there of collecting the balance due under the said act?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. 1,686.
2. \$35 in full.
3. \$2,000,000.
4. \$766,765.52 paid to date.
5. The liquidators believe that a further substantial sum—uncertain in amount—will be realized.

## POSTMASTERSHIP AT NEW ROSS, LUNenburg

Mr. ERNST:

1. Was W. S. Barkhouse of New Ross, county of Lunenburg, granted a certificate by the Civil Service Commission for appointment to the postmastership at New Ross aforesaid, in or about the year 1925?
2. If so, what was the exact date of the grant of such certificate?
3. Was W. S. Barkhouse appointed to said postmastership?
4. If not, upon whose recommendation was such appointment refused?
5. What charge or charges were brought against Mr. W. S. Barkhouse's appointment?
6. By whom were such charges preferred?
7. Was Mr. W. S. Barkhouse advised of such charges and was he given an opportunity to answer them?
8. Is the present postmaster at New Ross a returned soldier?
9. Is W. S. Barkhouse a returned soldier?

Hon. Mr. VENIOT:

1. Yes.
2. 1st April, 1925.
3. No.
- 4, 5 and 6. On representations made by government candidate for constituency, and Mr. Samuel Hiltz of Lake Ramsay to the effect that Mr. Barkhouse did not possess the confidence of the community, that he was not suitable and should not be entrusted with the management of the office.
7. No.
8. No.
9. Yes.