

at St. Gédéon, county of Chicoutimi, having refused to pay to Mr. S. Desjardins the price of certain pieces of timber and iron used in the said work, has been twice sued for the payment thereof?

2. Has the department been notified of the said actions at law?

3. Why has payment been refused to Mr. Desjardins?

4. What is the daily pay of Foreman Lavoie?

5. Does he receive, or has he received any allowance for travelling and board?

6. Is it true that his wages are paid even for days when it rains and no work is done?

7. Who recommended his appointment as foreman of the said work?

8. Why was not Mr. Elzéar Levesque, a master builder, entrusted with the building of the said wharf?

9. Is it true that Foreman Lavoie was sent from elsewhere to St. Gédéon simply to reward him for having changed his party in 1896, in consideration of promises made to him?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. It is known in the department that certain timber prepared by Mr. Desjardins, on his own responsibility, was refused by Mr. Lavoie, as it was not suitable for the work. 2. Not to the knowledge of the department that Mr. Lavoie was sued. 3. Was paid for all suitable timber and stone supplied. 4. \$2 a day. 5. No. 6. The foreman so far has only received one day's pay more than the workmen. 7. Mr. P. V. Savard, M.P. 8. Mr. Lavoie being appointed rendered it unnecessary to appoint an additional foreman. 9. The department has no information on this subject.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the Militia Department had any analysis made by the Department of Inland Revenue of the 'emergency food' bought by the Militia Department for use of the troops in South Africa?

2. If so, how many samples were submitted, and on what dates?

3. Were these samples that were analysed, if any, the same food that was shipped to South Africa?

4. What were the results as reported by the Inland Revenue Department?

5. On what date was the emergency food shipped from Canada to South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In answer to the first question: The Department of Militia sent to the Department of Inland Revenue on the 3rd February, 1900, two parcels of food for analysis; one taken from the packages of emergency food shipped to South Africa, the other from the food used in Kingston in March or April of a year ago. In answer to the second question: One sample of each was submitted on the 3rd February, 1900. In answer to the third question: One of the samples was of food shipped to South Africa, the other, as I have said, was a sample of the food used in Kingston. In answer to the fourth

question: I have already explained to the House that as thorough analyses are being made of these foods, I do not think it desirable now to make public the result of the analyses, except that I may say that they bear out literally the statement made to me in the letter which I read to this House from the Director General, that the foods are identical. In answer to the fifth question, I may say that I regret that I did not notice the reference to the date on which the food was to be delivered at Halifax, but it appears in the papers which I laid on the Table of the House. I think it is the 20th of January.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. MACDONALD (HURON).

Mr. PETER MACDONALD (East Huron). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. There is in the *Ottawa Citizen* of this morning an article in which there is a quotation purporting to have been taken from a speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) on Tuesday evening, in which he charged me with having a direct interest in a dredge which he called 'No. 9' and therefore, that I was sitting in the House in direct contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. Now, Sir, I wish to say that I have no interest directly or indirectly, remotely or approximately in any dredge in the world to-day. I therefore, think it wise on my own behalf and on behalf of those interested in me to make this statement, and to characterize the assertion of the hon. member for East Grey as literally and absolutely untrue.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I only wish to say this: That in the *Hansard* report, I noticed in correcting it that there was a mistake. Speaking of the circumstance of the owners of the property, I said 'I believed' that the member for Huron profits by the investment of his money in this way.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would you be kind enough to withdraw it?

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly. If the hon. member says he is not, I am certainly bound to withdraw the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E. I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) for the reasons why work has been stopped on the contract for building a section of the railway in Prince Edward Island. The contract was entered into not very long ago, and the work was supposed to have been commenced, but I am now