

be in the interests of both the employee and the employer.

5. The vast number of letters posted on Sunday, in fact, it might be said the whole of the letters posted on Sunday are not for local delivery, but for outside points and in most cases far distant points. The refusal to receive these letters on Sunday would mean a delay during the week of perhaps 12 to 24 hours and serious inconvenience to business, and it cannot be compared with the delivery of mails on Sunday to addresses locally, where all unnecessary work is supposed to cease, particularly, in view of the fact that all such letters are delivered in plenty of time for the opening of business on Monday morning. Moreover, these trains would run whether mails were placed on them or not, and the public and business people would naturally resent any failure on the part of the department to forward the mails on all running trains, involving as such action would make a delay of 24 hours in the transmission of a large portion of the correspondence for business centres. This has been specially recognized by parliament and exempted from the working of the Lord's Day Act.

6. The department is aware that for many years box holders have had access to their boxes on Sunday, but is not of the opinion that the present action will cause any serious inconvenience to the citizens at large, and has reason to believe that outside of the few business men who take advantage of Sunday delivery for the purpose of working themselves and their staff on Sunday, as well as the other days of the week, there is no desire for the keeping open of the post offices on Sunday.

7. The department is not aware that a large number of commercial men are said to arrange to pass Sunday in Winnipeg with their families to receive and answer their mail on that day.

8. Better opportunities for the observance of Sunday, and protection to labour.

9. The men engaged in sorting for Sunday box delivery will be relieved from duty. The department is unable to say definitely how many clerks require to be engaged in this work, but there must always be a considerable number of men engaged in sorting these mails for Sunday delivery.

10. The present action is not an experiment, but was taken after the fullest consideration by the department.

11. A circular was sent out from the department on the 20th January, 1910, to the postmasters of the offices above mentioned, instructing them that on and from the 1st February, 1910, the lobbies of their offices must be closed to the public on Sunday.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

BOAT HARBOUR, TONEY RIVER, PICTOU, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What was the amount expended in each year to date on construction of Boat harbour at Toney river, Pictou county, Nova Scotia?
2. What is the total paid to date?
3. Is the work completed?
4. What further sum is to be expended?
5. Who were superintendents or overseers of the work, for how many days and how much was each paid?
6. What is the length of each wharf constructed?
7. What is the depth of water at the outer end of the wharf at high tide and at low tide, respectively?
8. How much further out will the wharfs be extended?
9. When so extended what will be the depth of water at outer end of high tide, and at low tide, respectively?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2.

In 1905-6 . . . . .	\$4,727 55
1906-7 . . . . .	2,103 11
1907-8 . . . . .	758 05
1908-9 . . . . .	1,793 02

Total . . . . . \$9,381 73

3. No.

4. \$2,000.

5. H. McKinnon (1906-8), 169 days  
 at \$3 . . . . . \$507 00  
 D. A. Barry (1908-9), 29 days at  
 \$3.50 . . . . . 101 50  
 D. A. Barry (1908-9), 24 days at  
 \$3 . . . . . 72 00

Total . . . . . \$680 50

6 and 7. The works referred to are protection piers on east and west sides of a channel 1½ feet deep at low water and 7½ feet deep at high water; the east side protection pier is 291 feet long, and the west side one, 235 feet.

8 and 9. Fifty feet on each side, the depth of water at outer ends remaining the same as at present.

MR. BENJAMIN BOURGEOIS.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. At what dates were the services of Benjamin Bourgeois, division engineer, district 'B,' National Transcontinental Railway, dispensed with, and for what cause?
2. At whose instance was the investigation held, who investigated, and what is the report or finding?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

The following information is supplied by the Transcontinental Railway Commission: On the 31st January, 1910. The chief engineer having reported that the services of Mr. Bourgeois were unsatisfactory, an in-