

stituted, or is it their intention to institute, an inquiry in order to ascertain whether the still was placed in the Government shed by the employees of the Intercolonial, or by other persons?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The Government is aware that a still was seized at the freight shed of the Intercolonial Railway at L'Islet, 27th April, 1895. 2. The seizure was made and reported by Phileas Dubé. 3. The seizure report was forwarded through the Collector of Inland Revenue at Quebec, who was instructed to confer with the agents of the Department of Justice, and if evidence was sufficient to secure a conviction, to institute proceedings. 4. Yes. The Government have taken steps to ascertain who were the parties responsible for the still being found in the freight shed at L'Islet.

W. FINLAY, OF COURTRIGHT.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has one W. Finlay, of Courtright, recently been appointed to any position in the Customs service? If so, what is the position? What are the duties, and what is the compensation or allowance? How is such compensation or allowance paid i. e., monthly, or otherwise? What particular reason was there for such appointment? Have similar appointments been made at other parts of the province of Ontario recently? If so, where, and what are the names of the appointees?

Mr. WALLACE. In reply to the hon. gentlemen, I beg to say: 1. Yes, Mr. Finlay has been appointed to a position in the Customs service. 2. The position is that of acting preventive officer. 3. His duties are to control and guard the frontier south from Sarnia, to Corunna, Moore, Sombra, Davies Point, Baldoon, Oungh, Stag Island, and Walpole Island, for the prevention and detection of smuggling, also to see that duty is paid on all merchandise which may be imported to Stag Island and Walpole Island—which places, being popular summer resorts, import considerable quantities of goods and articles during the season of navigation. For this work he is remunerated at the rate of \$50 a month. 4. The amount is paid monthly. 5. The reason for such appointment is that the officer employed at this work last year, resigned. 6. No vacancy has arisen in other parts of the province of Ontario recently, and, consequently, no other similar appointments have been made. 7. Answered by the above.

MILITARY GROUNDS AT ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. By whose authority has a grocery shop been built on the military grounds at Annapolis? 2. Who are the lessees or tenants of the whole or any part of said military grounds? 3. What rents are paid for the use of said lands or any part

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

thereof? 4. Are any rents due for the use of said lands, and by whom, and why are the amounts not collected?

Mr. DICKEY. 1. I am not aware that any authority has been given to build a grocery shop on the military grounds at Annapolis. I have caused inquiry to be made immediately. 2. The department has at present only one tenant at Annapolis, a Mr. Andrew Gilmour. 3. The rental paid by Mr. Gilmour is \$12 per week. 4. There are no arrears due for the Annapolis property, save the claim the department holds against Mr. T. B. Mills for \$823.69. This claim is disputed by Mr. Mills. Legal proceedings have not yet been taken against Mr. Mills to decide the dispute.

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McISAAC asked, 1. Was the contract for carrying Her Majesty's mails between Malignant Cove and Ingonish, in the province of Nova Scotia, under the terms of an advertisement calling for tenders for said service, dated 1st March, 1895, awarded, and to whom? 2. What are the names of the persons who tendered, and the amounts of their respective tenders? 3. Were the tenders opened? If not, why not? 4. If the contract was not awarded under the terms of the advertisement to any of the persons who tendered, to whom was it awarded, for what amount, and for what reason?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contract for the Malignant Cove and Merigomish mail service was awarded to W. J. McDonald, but not under the terms of the advertisements calling for tenders. As the new contract was a renewal of the one now in operation, the tenders were not opened, and the department is therefore unaware of the particulars of the tenders received. The existing contract was renewed under authority of paragraph 2, section 61 of the Post Office Act.

DISMISSAL OF CONDUCTOR GEORGE McCULLY.

Mr. PATTERSON (Colchester) asked, 1. Has any application been received by the Minister of Railways and Canals for an investigation as to the reasons for the dismissal of conductor George McCully from the service of the Intercolonial Railway? 2. For what reasons were conductor McCully's services dispensed with? 3. Is it the intention to reinstate him in the railway service?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to state that an application asking for an investigation was received, but it was not considered necessary to hold one. His services were dispensed with because he was not considered a suit-