

2. Since January 15, 1922, at the rate of \$6,000 per annum.

3. The records indicate that Duncan Marshall, like many other able gentlemen, was defeated in the general elections of 1921.

4. No.

5. By order in council, P.C. 223 of February 7, 1922. (Under authority of Sec. 38C of the Civil Service Act as amended by C22 of Statutes of 1921).

6. No knowledge of such.

7. Answered by No. 6.

8. W. A. Dryden went to Brazil, Uruguay and the Argentine Republic on a mission for the Department of Agriculture but was not accompanied by any other agent or employee of the department.

9. Mr. Marshall spent some months in Great Britain on government business and, naturally, his expenses were paid by the government.

10. Not to the department's knowledge.

11. Answered by No. 10.

12. Duncan Marshall: Salary, \$6,274.19; Expenses, \$2,677.89; total \$8,952.08. W. A. Dryden: Advance for expenses, \$2,000.

13. Mr. Marshall is still in the employment of the government.

14. Mr. Dryden was never an employee of the government. On the mission indicated in the answer to question No. 8 his expenses were paid but he received no salary or other remuneration.

15. None.

16. Mr. Dryden has submitted a report on his observations and findings in connection with his trip to South America and Mr. Marshall has submitted a report on the Agricultural Instruction Act.

17. Both of these reports will be laid on the table of the House but it is not proposed to print either of them.

18. The investigational work conducted by Duncan Marshall in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act, Dominion Exhibitions, and attendance at various international live stock and dairy conventions could have been performed by expert officers already in the department only by considerable neglect of their present duties. Mr. Marshall's special knowledge of pure-bred live stock and the importation thereof, together with his previous study of and experience with the embargo question marked him out as the one man, with Dr. Grisdale, to act as expert adviser to the Canadian Cabinet representatives at the recent British-Canadian Conference on this important question.

25

#### WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO MONTREAL

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is it a fact that in August 1921, eighteen hundred to two thousand cars of wheat remained unloaded for weeks in the Port of Montreal?

2. What is the cost per bushel of transportation of wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal?

3. What does the Montreal Harbour Commission charge per bushel for the transferring of wheat to its elevators?

4. What is its charge per bushel to load the grain on board ship?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. In August 1921 there were at different times in the Montreal terminals and Port of Montreal from one thousand to two thousand cars waiting to be unloaded, but the peak of from eighteen hundred to two thousand cars did not exist for longer than six or seven days.

2. The cost of transportation of wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal at the present time by rail is 34½ cents per 100 pounds or 20.70 cents per bushel.

3. The charge for elevation of wheat from vessels to commissioners' grain elevators is four-tenths of 1 cent per bushel, including storage in the elevator up to 10 days free, and free fire and explosion insurance. In addition there is a charge of \$2.75 per thousand bushels for shovelling the grain to the elevator buckets in the vessel's hold. The charge for elevation of wheat ex railway cars is six-tenths of 1 cent per bushel including storage in elevator up to 10 days free, and free fire and explosion insurance. The shovelling in this case is absorbed in the elevation charge.

4. The charge for delivery of grain to ocean steamer over the grain conveyor system or otherwise is four-tenths of 1 cent per bushel.

MISS BARBARA LEE

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. When, and in what capacity was Miss Barbara Lee employed at the Immigration Building, St. John (West), New Brunswick?

2. By whom were her services engaged?

3. Was she dismissed? If so, by whom?

4. Was she at any time required to perform services for which she had not been engaged? If so, by whom?

5. Who is in immediate charge of the dining rooms at this immigration building, and is such person in charge as an employee of the government or under contract?

6. Had such person any right to engage or dismiss help?

7. Is the government aware that Miss Lee has for some years given capable service in connection with immigration service dining rooms, and has been driven out of her position by the actions of the person in charge?

8. Does the government propose to restore Miss Lee to her position?