

GALOPS RAPIDS—DISMISSED EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Lister) asked, Were any of the engineers employed on the Galops Rapids works dismissed or suspended? If so, what were the names of such engineers, and were they dismissed or suspended? If dismissed or suspended, what was the cause? Is it the intention of the department to reinstate such engineers? Has any recommendation been made to the Government in that direction? Has a suit been pending between the Government and the contractors respecting the said works? If so, has a decision been rendered in favour of the contractors? Were the engineers given to understand that they were suspended only pending such suit? Was there any evidence of collusion between the contractors and engineers?

Mr. HAGGART. The services of Mr. Haycock and Mr. Ross were dispensed with; their services were no longer required. Dr. Reid, M.P., has asked that Mr. Haycock be re-employed, as has also Mr. Haycock's brother. A suit has been pending with the contractors for deepening and straightening the Galops Rapid channel. A judgment has been rendered in favour of the contractors. There was no evidence proving collusion between the engineers and the contractors.

SEWER IN VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to repair the sewer of Victoria Street, in Valleyfield, in the way asked for by the Council of the town? If not, what do the Government intend to do in the case?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not come to the conclusion to repair the sewer on Victoria Street, Valleyfield, in the manner asked for by the Council of that town. The Government have not decided what they will do in the matter.

GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING COMPANY.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the claim of the Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Company, arising out of the cancellation by the Government of their contract for the construction of a portion of the Cornwall Canal, been settled? If so, when, and on what terms? If not, in what condition is it now?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The claim in connection with the cancellation of Messrs. Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Company of a portion of Sections 5 and 8 and the whole of Sections 6 and 7 of the Cornwall Canal, has been settled. 2. On the 18th April, 1894, by payment of 15 per cent on the value of work estimated as remaining to be done, amounting to \$29,350.

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. FRASER asked, Have the Government received petitions from a large number of persons urging that the mail route from Antigonish to Sherbrooke be changed and run from Sunnybrae, Pictou county, to Sherbrooke? Do the Government propose making the change?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government has received petitions from a number of persons urging that the mail route from Antigonish to Sherbrooke be changed and run from Sunnybrae, Pictou County, to Sherbrooke. The Government does not propose to make the change asked for.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT LAND—ISLE AUX NOIX.

Mr. RIDER asked, 1. Did the Government duly advertise the sale of the Government land, consisting of over 135 acres, situated on the east side of the Richelieu River, in the county of Iberville, opposite "Isle aux Noix," before selling the same to Hiram Sewell Foster, under patent dated the 16th May, 1894, for the sum of \$600? 2. What reasons had the Government for selling said property at that time? 3. Was it sold after valuation? If so, who was the valuator? When was the valuation made, and what was the amount named in the report? 4. Were the negotiations carried through by any member of Parliament? If so, by whom? 5. How was payment made? If by cheque, on what bank? 6. Is the Government aware that any member is, or was, directly or indirectly personally interested in the purchase thereof?

Mr. DALY. 1. The Government did not advertise the sale, for the reason that the property was sold under the provisions of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 55, section 5, subsection 3. That subsection authorizes the sale of any ordnance lands which are occupied with the consent of the Crown to the person in possession without resorting to public auction. 2. Because it was considered a desirable thing in the public interest to sell the property, and the leaseholder had expressed a desire to buy. 3. It had been inspected in 1888 by the late Mr. Mills, the clerk in charge at the time of ordnance and admiralty lands, and appraised at \$600. 4. The negotiations were not conducted by a member of Parliament. 5. Payment was made by deposit to the credit of the Receiver General in the Merchants Bank of Canada. 6. The Government have no reason to think that any member of Parliament is interested in the property in any way.

ISLE AUX NOIX.

Mr. RIDER asked, Does the Government still own the property known as the "Isle