

3. How many inspectors has said company in its employ?

4. Did the commission pay these inspectors at the rate of six dollars a day? If not, what was the per diem allowances?

5. Has the said Canadian Inspection Company done any inspection for the Government of Canada during the past year? If so, how many inspectors have been employed, and what have they been paid per day?

Mr. REID:

1, 2, 3, 4. No information.

5. Public Works:

Chief Engineer's Branch: Inspection of timber, 20 cents a thousand; steel, 23 to 35 cents a ton; sluice valves, \$7.50 a day for 2½ days, and inspection of the Prince Rupert dry dock, \$225 a month for one inspector.

Dredging Branch: Three inspectors employed for 65 days between 1st June and 30th October, 1915, at \$7.50 a day on new bucket line of the dredge Mastadon.

Chief Architect's Branch: For inspection of steel work on two public buildings, 25 and 30 cents a ton.

Telegraph Branch: Inspecting 34.80 tons galvanized wire at 75 cents a ton.

Railways and Canals: It is not possible to state how many inspectors were employed as the inspection was paid for at a tonnage rate. For shop and mill inspection of bridge steel and reinforcing steel for the Welland ship canal, of bridge steel for the Hudson Bay railway, Dartmouth Branch Line and Trent canal, the rate was 30 cents per ton. For steel rails for the Hudson Bay railway the rate was .05 cents per ton, for track fastenings .20 cents per ton and for cement .03½ cents per brl. The regular rate for field inspection of bridge erection was \$130 per month, plus travelling expenses to and from the work at commencement and end of job, but this was increased to \$150 per month in case of Manitou Rapids bridge, Hudson Bay railway, and \$175 per month at Port Nelson. Some inspection work was done by the above company for the Government railways at unit prices.

#### IMPRISONMENT OF JACK REID FOR SEDITION.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What were the words pronounced by Jack Reid, who was, as alleged, condemned to 15 months' imprisonment for sedition at Calgary?

2. Were the words pronounced by Reid more offensive than those pronounced by Armand Lavergne, M.P.P., on the floor of the Quebec Legislative Assembly?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to liberate Jack Reid? If so, when? If not, why not?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to

give equal rights to Reid and Armand Lavergne? If not, why not?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The prosecution of Reid was initiated and carried on by the local authorities. The information of this Government as to the words he pronounced is derived from the judge's charge, copy of which is hereto annexed.

2. The Government has no information as to the words said to have been pronounced by Armand Lavergne, M.L.A., on the floor of the Quebec Legislative Assembly.

3. There are petitions before the Department of Justice for the exercise of executive clemency by His Royal Highness the Governor General. These petitions are receiving the careful consideration which is given to all such applications.

4. The right of both these men are governed by, and equal, under the law. They have been and will be equally respected by the Government.

Rex vs. John Reid—Judge's Charge to the Jury.

The Court: Gentlemen of the Jury, the defendant is charged with having used this language at three different meetings held in the province of Alberta, two held at Evarts and one at Rocky Mountain House, and he wishes to be tried by me alone, but I thought that this was eminently a case fitted for six jurymen, six citizens of this province to deliberate upon, because it is an offence of a somewhat peculiar nature. In regard to the majority of offences which are made indictable under our Criminal Code or under our law of Canada, there would be very little difference of opinion, I apprehend, and very few would express dissent to the fact that those things are made indictable offences, such as theft, arson and murder, but in regard to the offences charged it has some peculiar properties and is one where good common sense requires to be exercised in a remarkable degree, because there are certain principles which must be recognized and sometimes there may be an apparent conflict of those principles; there may be a difficulty of adjustment so they may meet on a common ground; in other words, there may be some difficulty in a proper appreciation of just what a man may do and what he may not do when he is advocating political ideas or when he is discussing different forms of government—therefore, I thought that six men exercising the common sense which they have acquired through their knowledge of the world would be admirably fitted and even perhaps better fitted than I myself, to adjudicate upon so important a matter, so my duty will be to direct you on what I believe to be the law in relation to such offences and to call your attention to the evidence adduced and the proper way to arrive at a correct conclusion. Then the matter will be one for you to determine as a question of fact.

When the authorities charge any person with an indictable offence under our law, he is entitled to the presumption that he is innocent and the duty devolves upon the prosecution to