

Children's Summer Footwear



We are now showing a complete range of new Slippers for children. We will be pleased to have you look these over.



You can get anything you wish in OXFORDS, TIES, STRAP SLIPPERS, PUMPS or SANDALS in the best makes.



In the children's department we carry the best makes, including HURLBUT, CLASSIC, MACFARLANE and OXUMS. And we fit them correctly.

Ashplants
448-450-452 DUNDAS ST.

S. O. S.

Help Save the Home!

To Principals and Teachers, Scholars and Parents: We will send "Home Inspection Blanks" to the teaching staff throughout Ontario for distribution among their pupils.

As patriotic Canadians, your sympathetic co-operation is sought in the important work of conserving the lives and property of our people from destruction by fire.

The inspection is planned to take place during the province during the week of May 2. The primary object of this inspection is to draw attention to hazardous conditions in the homes and have them removed or corrected by the householders.

The housing problem makes the protection of dwellings of paramount importance.

CLEAN UP. Prevent fires by removing the cause.

Information and text books, "Conservation of Life and Property from Fire," "Lighting, Its Origin and Control," on request.

ONTARIO FIRE PREVENTION LEAGUE, INC.
In affiliation with Ontario Fire Marshal's Office
153 UNIVERSITY AVENUE,
TORONTO.
George F. Lewis, Secretary.

300 PASSENGERS TAKEN OFF STRANDED LINER

BLOCK ISLAND, R. I., April 29.—Three hundred passengers were taken off the Portuguese steamer Mormugao, which ran around on the west side of Block Island in a thick fog this morning while bound from Lisbon for New Bedford and New York. It is planned to transfer the remaining 148 passengers to-morrow morning.

FLU EPIDEMIC AMONG SOLDIERS OF FRANCE

PARIS, April 29.—An epidemic of a gripe of somewhat serious proportions has prevailed for some time in French army garrisons and has especially affected the class of 1921. The disease was communicated by enlisted men who came from regions where the epidemic has been prevalent, and its development was favored by the lowering of the temperature. The war ministry, in a note issued to-day, says the epidemic now seems to be decreasing in intensity.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM, TRAIN NO. 16

Commencing Sunday, May 1, Grand Trunk train No. 16 (Eastern Flyer) will leave London at 7:00 p.m., and arrive Toronto at 10:00 p.m. Instead of 10:30 p.m., as at present. Effective with this change, the schedule of this train will be operated via Junction Cut, and will not go into Hamilton, but coach and parlor car service will be operated to Junction Cut, connecting immediately with train at Junction Cut for Hamilton. Full particulars at "Clock Corner." R. E. Ruse, C. P. & T. A.

INGRAM CASE IS UP AT ST. THOMAS

Probe Into Doing of Police Court Is Opened

CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE Decision to Be Given Later, It Is Announced

ST. THOMAS, April 29.—(By Staff Reporter).—The Council chamber at the courthouse was packed to capacity this afternoon, even available standing room being occupied, when the police commission investigation into charges against Officer Samuel McKewen was opened. The complainant, L. S. Ingram, of this city, was represented by P. H. Bartlett, of London, and Officer McKewen, the defendant, by Andrew Grant, of Amherst, and Grant, this city. The commissioners were Judge C. O. Ermatinger, Mayor F. L. Brinkman and A. F. Maxwell, magistrate. After hearing both sides of the case, in which a large amount of conflicting evidence was submitted, the chairman of the commission, Mayor Brinkman, announced that he had to leave for London at 5 o'clock, and the evidence would be gone over at a later meeting of the commission, which was adjourned in the meantime. Other complaints were laid over until a later meeting.

The chairman announced on opening the meeting that he had received a complaint from L. S. Ingram, regarding the treatment received by him at the hands of the police of the local force. The letter stated that at 4 a.m. on the 29th of March, he met Officer McKewen near the Talbot Hotel and asked him where he could find a doctor. The officer charged him with being drunk, and according to the latter, remarked: "I have taken enough lip from fellows like you." He then struck McKewen over the head with his baton. He later grabbed the policeman in order to protect himself. He was struck several times over the head and finally dragged to the city hall by Officer McKewen and Grant. He asked for a doctor and was refused. On reaching the cell McKewen, he alleged, pushed him in the face and banged him against the door. After considerable shouting and rattling of the cell door, Sgt. Ketchaw came and told him that if he had any money he could have a doctor, and Dr. T. L. Gray was called.

HAD A COUPLE OF DRINKS. Mr. Ingram was then called, and, on being sworn, stated that he had a couple of drinks on the evening of March 29th, but had retired to bed about 11:30. He got up again about 3 o'clock in the morning, being unable to sleep. He consumed a small quantity of liquor, about three ounces, and about 5:30 went out to get something to eat at a cafe. He had been derided down the street by the Y.M.C.A., when he met Officer McKewen, who advised him to go to the police station and get a taxi, and went into the Y.M.C.A. to do so. It was dark in the building and he couldn't find the telephone number, so he came out and walked toward home. On reaching the Talbot Hotel he looked around and saw McKewen following him and dodging in the rear doorway. He walked back and asked him where he could get something to eat. The policeman then grabbed him by the collar and told him he was drunk; that he had taken enough lip from fellows like him and would lock him up.

Witness asked him what he meant by grabbing him that way. The officer struck him, stating at the same time that if he didn't come along he would knock his brains out.

"That man was just about as mad as he could be, and I was afraid he would kill me," declared the witness. He then described the tussle in the middle of the roadway and as a friend called for help. He finally got away from the officer and ran away. He was again opposite the city hall and dragged into the building. To Mr. Grant witness said he had been working for E. Dalby, local painter, at that time. He was now working in London. He had lived in St. Thomas for 15 years.

"Were you drunk on the night in question?" asked Mr. Grant. "I am not saying anything about that. I don't think I was," replied witness.

Mr. Grant: "Did you kick McKewen at all?"

Witness: "Not at first. I did when I got to the city hall because I thought he would kill me. He was mad."

SHADOWED BY OFFICER. G. Norman, the next witness called, stated that he was standing not far away when the fracas occurred. He saw McKewen dodging in the doorway and following Ingram as though shadowing him. He saw Ingram turn around and walk back to where McKewen was. He could not hear what was being said, but he saw McKewen drag Ingram on to the edge of the sidewalk and hit him over the head.

He then dragged him out into the middle of the road, and when on the street car tracks McKewen hit him several times and swore at him. Ingram then got away and ran toward the city hall. He saw blood lying in the road after the prisoner had gone, but did not follow to the city hall to see what had happened there. To Mr. Grant witness said he heard Officer McKewen call to him to go and get a policeman. He refused to have anything to do with it. He did not know Ingram at that time.

P. Hines and George Martin, who were coming home from a party with Norman, corroborated this evidence. They did not follow to the police station. They also saw the blood on the sidewalk and on the road between the street car tracks. Hines also saw the crack in the wall. He heard a crack as if a blow had been struck, and on going into the city hall he saw the prisoner covered with blood and saw McKewen wiping his baton.

Mr. Grant—What was McKewen wiping his baton with?

Witness—I don't know.

Mr. Bartlett—Was it a rag or with his hand?

Witness—It was a rag of some kind.

COVERED WITH BLOOD. W. H. Bailey, a special policeman at the time of the affair, came into the station in time to see the complainant being covered with blood. His condition showed that he had been in a hard fight. He saw McKewen take something from him and turn his back while he looked it over. He heard a commotion, exceptionally rough and shoved him toward the door of the police station. Ingram asked for a doctor. On going toward the door he turned his head and started to say something, but Sgt. Ketchaw ordered him to the cells.

Mr. Grant—What would you do if you were going to arrest a prisoner who turned on you?

Witness—I refuse to answer that.

Asked by Mr. Bartlett about his experience as an officer, Mr. Bailey said that as sergeant of the guard, in the army a man had to know how to handle drunken men. A drunken man should be handled more carefully than any other.

Mr. Grant—Would you use force if the man resisted?

Witness—The art of self-defense is not dead in any of us, sir.

Mr. Grant—The more a man resisted

the more force you would use, is that it?

Witness—I would say the more diplomacy you would use, sir.

BRUISED AND BLEEDING. Ernie Phillips, another special officer, stated that he saw Ingram in the station. He was recovered from him. He went to assist in taking him to the cells, but Officer McKewen stepped up and took prisoner away from him. McKewen banged Ingram against the head against the door of the station.

Dr. Gray, who attended the complainant, said that he was called about 6 o'clock in the morning. He found the complainant bruised and badly bleeding. He could not attach a wound at that time and he ordered the police to send the man to his office at 9 o'clock after police court. He found a cut at the hair line on his forehead. He stitched three cuts, using witness examined him and he got hot water and bathed his wounds. Witness said that the cut could have been caused by falling against a building, but he would give no opinion as to how they were caused.

STEVEN, JANITOR OF THE Y.M.C.A., said that Ingram came in on the night in question on two occasions. He saw him at 11:30 p.m. and 12:30 p.m. minutes elapsed between his two entrances.

OFFICER GIVES EVIDENCE. Officer Samuel McKewen was next called. He said that he had been a policeman since 1917. This was the first accusation of this kind against him. A call came from Manitoba street about the night of March 29 and he went down to see about it. The residents complained of a man prowling around the house. He found one, but on entering the street he met Ingram and told him to go home. It was about 1:25 in the morning when he met Ingram and saw him go into the Y.M.C.A. He saw Ingram later coming out of the Y.M.C.A. and saw him being taken to the Talbot Hotel and seeing that he was intoxicated he placed him under arrest.

Ingram resisted, using very profane language and kicked at the officer. He then tried to put the handcuffs on him and he held his hands together. In the scuffle that followed both witness and Ingram fell two or three times against the building.

Ingram declared that McKewen had arrested Allan Hewitt to get promotion and now wanted to arrest him so he would make a showing. Witness then called on Norman who was standing near the tracks and told him to go and telephone for a policeman. He advised the officer to go to

He denied hitting Ingram over the head with the baton nor did he bang his head against the wall. He thought that the complainant had got his injuries by falling against the wall. He had used very profane language.

Witness—"He says you called him a pet name, too, is that right?"

Witness—"No, sir."

CAN'T EXPLAIN BLOOD. To Mr. Bartlett witness said he might have hit Ingram on his arm or somewhere. He could not explain presence of blood although he admitted that he was bleeding. Ingram might have got his injuries from the wall.

Mr. Bartlett—"You fell against the wall, too, did you lose any blood?"

Witness—"No sir, I was careful not to cut myself."

Mr. Bartlett—"You mean to suggest then that all these witnesses are telling an untruth when they say they saw you hit him and heard the blows struck?"

Witness—"Yes sir, I do."

Mr. Bartlett then wanted to know witness would handle a drunken man that way. He said that he had never done so yet and has no intention of doing so. He had not had any experience as a policeman before joining the local force in 1917. He had never handled anyone roughly.

Mr. Bartlett—Were you pretty mad at the time?

Witness—No, sir, I was quite sober.

Witness also denied absolutely that he had used his baton. He admitted that the witnesses might all have made up their story without foundation.

IN BAD CONDITION. John Grant, another policeman who assisted McKewen, said that Ingram was in a "beastly drunken condition." He had never heard such language as the man used. He corroborated the evidence of McKewen in every particular.

William Calvert, porter at the Talbot Hotel, was asked what name Ingram had called him on the morning in question. He created some amusement when he said that he wouldn't like to repeat it, it wasn't nice. The man was undoubtedly drunk, he said.

Sgt. Ketchaw told much the same evidence as other witnesses. He said that Ingram asked for a doctor, and after finding that he was unable to pay for one he sent for Dr. Gray, who arrived about 6 o'clock. He asked McKewen what he had to say to the charge of prisoner that he had struck him with a baton. McKewen said he didn't hit him at all.

Chief Armstrong was talking to Ingram in the police dock next morning. He asked him where he got his injuries. He replied that he had fallen on the street and struck a building.

Mr. Bartlett—What relation is Mr. McKewen to you, chief?

Witness—He is no relation of mine, only that he is married to a niece of mine. That doesn't cut any ice, though.

"A QUARRELSOME FELLOW." A policeman Joseph McCully said that he had known Ingram for many years. He was a quarrelsome fellow. He was also present with the chief when he said that he got his cuts by falling against the curb.

Mr. Bartlett—He's a pretty quarrelsome man, then. Just enough so to go overseas and fight for three years, is that it?

Witness—I wasn't overseas, so I don't know about that.

Mr. Bartlett—Do you mean to tell me that you come here to injure a man's character with your evidence, yet you don't know anything about him?

Witness—I know him all right. He's a bad actor.

Mr. Bartlett—Now, tell me, officer, has he ever been charged with any offense that you know of outside of this?

Witness—I don't know. I don't think so.

Ingram, on being recalled, denied absolutely that he had made the above statement to the police. He had pleaded guilty to being drunk and said a fine. He had not said at any time that he fell against the building.

In summing up Mr. Bartlett pointed out that the policeman did not seek to justify his having struck Ingram, because he knew that it was not justifiable. He admitted hitting him on the body, however, while Mr. Ketchaw said that he denied it entirely on the morning in question. Mr. Bartlett stated that a case had undoubtedly been proven.

Mr. Grant held that if such a case were proven the commission must ask again asked for the officer. His action in telling the complainant to go home and then later hitting him with out provocation didn't agree at all.

He said that Chief Armstrong would certainly censure an officer who acted in the way witnesses described without the matter coming before a commission. He was inclined to believe the stories about hitting were a put-up job between the witnesses.

ANOTHER CHARGE LAID. Another charge was laid against a member of the force by a local business man, but there was no time to dispose of it to-day. The case of J. Fitzpatrick was also not considered, although his suggestion that the fee system be abolished was taken up by the commission and will be considered.

WILL NOT REDUCE PERMANENT FORCE

Motion In Commons Defeated By 60 To 37.

NO MORE ROSS RIFLES. Announcement Made Following Discussion Of Weapon.

OTTAWA, April 29.—(Canadian Press Dispatch).—After the House had sat until daylight this morning the Government this evening decided that on and after Monday it would save daylight by moving the hands of the Parliament clock an hour forward in common with the rest of the clocks in Ottawa. Daylight saving will be in vogue on and after Monday, announced the premier.

Military estimates were before the House the greater part of the day and they caused a flurry. Various items came in for criticism by either Liberals or farmers and an amendment to reduce an item of \$8,250,000 for Canada's permanent force was moved by Major C. G. Power (Quebec South) and defeated by 60 to 37. The item carried after the House had resumed in the evening.

TROOPS AND POLICE. The reduction of the permanent force and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police was brought up by P. S. Cahill (Ontario) who asked if it had been decided whether the two forces should be consolidated. He suggested that a police force of militia, stated that a police force had been found necessary for the maintenance of law and order, particularly in the West, and had been decided to continue the two forces, both at reduced strength.

The Ross rifle was debated at some length and it was agreed that none of them are now being made.

A strong protest was voiced by Liberal members when Hon. E. K. Spence, minister of defence, introduced a bill to amend the Civil Service Act, in regard to appointments, promotions and transfers and recommend that the bill be passed until discussion in the House.

A special committee for consideration of the bill was named, consisting of Messrs. Spence, Charles, Scott, Currier, Griesbach, Thompson (Yukon), Calder, Gault, Crutcher, Hetherington, Chisholm, Deane, Kennedy (Glenora), and Johnston.

LIBERAL MEMBERS protested against the bill being sent to committee without proper discussion. The prime minister replied that it was only a skeleton bill and would be filled out by the committee. Members of the opposition urged the Government with seeking to get back to a patronage basis, in moving to take appointments and promotions out of the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

The bill was subsequently allowed to stand still until Monday for second reading.

In the evening the House took up public works department estimates. A. T. Leger (Lent, N. B.) protested that an item of \$86,500 for public buildings in the Province of New Brunswick, \$83,500 was being spent in St. John. He wished to know why St. John was so favored. Hon. F. R. McDermid replied that it was found this year that most of the essential work was in large centers. No work was being undertaken this year that was not essential.

The House continued discussing estimates until 1 o'clock, when adjournment was taken.

After preliminary had been disposed of in the afternoon, Hon. Mr. Spence moved the second reading of his bill to amend the Civil Service Act. Mr. King asked for an explanation, and it was explained that the measure was merely a skeleton to be filled out by the committee.

Still Mr. King wanted an explanation "even of the skeleton."

Mr. Spence urged the House to allow the second reading to pass without discussion and to reserve debate until after the bill had been returned from the special committee.

J. A. Robb asked whether, in view of the fact that the estimates had been announced to commence very shortly, the Government would put the bill through the second reading immediately and act upon it next year.

Mr. Meighen replied that it was hoped to have the matter before the committee without delay and have a report ready behind the Government, and it was explained that the measure was merely a skeleton to be filled out by the committee.

Mr. Meighen replied that the bill was distributed to the members. He had already discussed the principle of the changes proposed when, some time ago, it had been a day or two in the House. The bill was simply a provision for the taking of certain classes of civil servants out of nomination and placing them in the operation of the commission and certain other classes of civil servants out of nomination and placing them in the operation of the commission.

Ernest Lapointe said that if the bill meant anything at all it meant a return to patronage, and he announced that he would vote against the measure.

Major C. G. Power said that on behalf of his constituents who had voted for the Government candidate in the election, believing that the Government would live up to its promise of abolishing patronage, he must protest and oppose this measure. It was the duty of every member of the House to keep the Government from backsliding once it had started on the path of uplift.

Hon. Hugh Guthrie said there appeared to be a misunderstanding as to the scope of this bill. As it stood now it had to be referred to a special committee for thorough threshing out.

He could see no harm in allowing the bill to stand over until early next week. The real work on the bill would come during the meetings of the committee handling it.

Mr. Findlay asked the prime minister what it was intended to give the commission to do to replace these classes of civil servants which were being taken out of its control.

Mr. Meighen replied that they would simply be in the same position as they were before the act was passed. The civil service commission would still have control of permanent appointments.

A motion to adjourn the debate was carried and the House went into supply on militia and defense estimates.

Questioned by Major Power the Minister of Militia, Mr. Keen, said that a large portion of the Ross rifles now on hand would, it was hoped, be made serviceable. Quite a number of offers to purchase these rifles had been made, but none had been sold yet. They were now in storage and a number would be converted for use in this country.

A MISTAKE, HE SAYS. Brig.-Gen. Griesbach had never been able to see why Canada wanted to manufacture a rifle of special design. He thought it was a mistake for Canada to manufacture a rifle different from that used in Great Britain. The fact was that the Canadian militia was armed with Ross rifles. When the war began there was, of course, a great demand for rifles. The Ross rifle was target work had proven satisfactory and the first Canadian contingent was equipped with this rifle. At the battle of Ypres in April, 1915, it was found that the Ross rifles jammed in rapid fire. The claim was made that the men were not trained in the manipulation of the bolt, but Gen. Griesbach insisted that a bolt should not be so intricate as to cause difficulty, especially when rapid fire was necessary.

Another claim was that bad ammunition was supplied to the men. Possibly this was so, but the Lee-Enfield rifles used by the British troops had never heard of a Lee-Enfield jamming. The morale of the Canadian troops had been damaged by their experience with the Ross rifle.

The second and third divisions were armed with the Ross rifles, except for the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry. They heard from the first division regarding the Ross rifle. The order to restore confidence on the part of his own men in the Ross rifle, Gen. Griesbach said that he had constructed a test with 100 men from each company, a total of 400 men. Some rifles jammed at the third round. The highest reached, generally speaking, was 60 rounds, although some men got something like 90. The result of this test, which had been held to restore confidence, was that the Ross rifle was a failure.

Mr. H. B. Murphy wanted to know if the 400 men had tested any other rifle.

Gen. Griesbach replied in the negative. No other rifle had been in question by the troops. In the fighting of May, 1916, the very young troops had slackened owing to the jamming of the Ross rifle. Another company had averaged 27 rounds. Another company had averaged a third of the rifle had jammed.

"That they would never have to use the Ross rifle again, and I told them to keep themselves to Lee-Enfields wherever they could."

"There was quite a traffic grew up in the hospital he had to check his rifle. The order was given to substitute a Lee-Enfield for the Ross rifle. The payment of five francs, and a good many soldiers obtained their rifles in this way."

T. W. Caldwell wanted to know if the five francs were provided by the soldier himself, and Gen. Griesbach said they were. He explained further that after the fighting in June, of that year, the order was finally issued for the arming of all the troops with Lee-Enfields. He did not think it was fair to say that the Ross rifle had caused the death of a large number of men. He had heard that charge made by the father of a soldier who had lost his life; and it turned out that the man had been armed with a Lee-Enfield, while in addition to this, he was killed in an artillery action.

Mr. Murphy asked if the Ross rifle had been manufactured in Canada. The minister replied that none had been made for the army.

Mr. McKenzie said that he thought the Government should dispose of all the Ross rifles in its possession. He should not even be used for the purpose of making small arms.

MAKING SMALL ARMS. To a question by Mr. Murphy the minister replied that no rifles were being manufactured at present in the Government. Small arms and small arm ammunition were being turned out at the rate of 75,000 per month for inspection of the committee then took up \$28,000 for pay and allowances of the staff of headquarters and in the military districts. This item showed a reduction of \$85,000 from last year.

Mr. Murphy asked if the minister had ever considered the advisability of having the manufacture of small arms in the Province of New Brunswick, \$83,500 was being spent in St. John. He wished to know why St. John was so favored. Hon. F. R. McDermid replied that it was found this year that most of the essential work was in large centers. No work was being undertaken this year that was not essential.

The House continued discussing estimates until 1 o'clock, when adjournment was taken.

After preliminary had been disposed of in the afternoon, Hon. Mr. Spence moved the second reading of his bill to amend the Civil Service Act. Mr. King asked for an explanation, and it was explained that the measure was merely a skeleton to be filled out by the committee.

Still Mr. King wanted an explanation "even of the skeleton."

Mr. Spence urged the House to allow the second reading to pass without discussion and to reserve debate until after the bill had been returned from the special committee.

J. A. Robb asked whether, in view of the fact that the estimates had been announced to commence very shortly, the Government would put the bill through the second reading immediately and act upon it next year.

Mr. Meighen replied that it was hoped to have the matter before the committee without delay and have a report ready behind the Government, and it was explained that the measure was merely a skeleton to be filled out by the committee.

Ernest Lapointe said that if the bill meant anything at all it meant a return to patronage, and he announced that he would vote against the measure.

Major C. G. Power said that on behalf of his constituents who had voted for the Government candidate in the election, believing that the Government would live up to its promise of abolishing patronage, he must protest and oppose this measure. It was the duty of every member of the House to keep the Government from backsliding once it had started on the path of uplift.

Hon. Hugh Guthrie said there appeared to be a misunderstanding as to the scope of this bill. As it stood now it had to be referred to a special committee for thorough threshing out.

He could see no harm in allowing the bill to stand over until early next week. The real work on the bill would come during the meetings of the committee handling it.

chally when rapid fire was necessary. Another claim was that bad ammunition was supplied to the men. Possibly this was so, but the Lee-Enfield rifles used by the British troops had never heard of a Lee-Enfield jamming. The morale of the Canadian troops had been damaged by their experience with the Ross rifle.

The second and third divisions were armed with the Ross rifles, except for the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry. They heard from the first division regarding the Ross rifle. The order to restore confidence on the part of his own men in the Ross rifle, Gen. Griesbach said that he had constructed a test with 100 men from each company, a total of 400 men. Some rifles jammed at the third round. The highest reached, generally speaking, was 60 rounds, although some men got something like 90. The result of this test, which had been held to restore confidence, was that the Ross rifle was a failure.

Mr. H. B. Murphy wanted to know if the 400 men had tested any other rifle.

Gen. Griesbach replied in the negative. No other rifle had been in question by the troops. In the fighting of May, 1916, the very young troops had slackened owing to the jamming of the Ross rifle. Another company had averaged 27 rounds. Another company had averaged a third of the rifle had jammed.

"That they would never have to use the Ross rifle again, and I told them to keep themselves to Lee-Enfields wherever they could."

"There was quite a traffic grew up in the hospital he had to check his rifle. The order was given to substitute a Lee-Enfield for the Ross rifle. The payment of five francs, and a good many soldiers obtained their rifles in this way."

T. W. Caldwell wanted to know if the five francs were provided by the soldier himself, and Gen. Griesbach said they were. He explained further that after the fighting in June, of that year, the order was finally issued for the arming of all the troops with Lee-Enfields. He did not think it was fair to say that the Ross rifle had caused the death of a large number of men. He had heard that charge made by the father of a soldier who had lost his life; and it turned out that the man had been armed with a Lee-Enfield, while in addition to this, he was killed in an artillery action.

Mr. Murphy asked if the Ross rifle had been manufactured in Canada. The minister replied that none had been made for the army.

Mr. McKenzie said that he thought the Government should dispose of all the Ross rifles in its possession. He should not even be used for the purpose of making small arms.

MAKING SMALL ARMS. To a question by Mr. Murphy the minister replied that no rifles were being manufactured at present in the Government. Small arms and small arm ammunition were being turned out at the rate of 75,000 per month for inspection of the committee then took up \$28,000 for pay and allowances of the staff of headquarters and in the military districts. This item showed a reduction of \$8