

ments. That may be so. But the facts are, as I understand, that this is a piece of Ordnance land in Montreal, known as Logan's Farm, that it was leased for a term of years to the city of Montreal, that while it was so leased this man Desmarteau squatted on a portion of it, and turned it into a brickyard; and that, so far from making any improvements that would benefit the property, he devastated it by making excavations for the purpose of carrying on the brick business. An action was taken against him in the Superior Court of Montreal, and after a great deal of litigation, judgment was given compelling him to pay \$850, being \$200 for sand removed for brick-making, \$400 damages owing to his excavations, and \$250 for rental at the rate of \$50 a year for five years, and giving the Crown possession of the property. He appealed against this judgment, and the appeal was dismissed; and then he presented the petition, which, as I have said, asks as a matter of grace that he should be paid this large sum. As a matter of fact the Crown have never been able to get from him the taxable costs in the suit. Some bricks were seized, but they realized only \$183.

Mr. LAURIER. I know nothing of the facts, but simply state them as they were given to me by Desmarteau himself. However, the answer the hon. Minister gives, that he would not take advantage of any plea which could be raised between subject and subject, is quite satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

THE STEAMER *ADMIRAL*.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. TARTE) moved for:

Copies of any Order or Orders in Council, adopted between the years 1883 and 1888, in relation to the steamer *Admiral* and the service performed by the said steamer between Dalhousie and Gaspé or other points, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Copies of the contract or contracts between the owners or owner or person in possession of the steamer *Admiral* and the Government, between the years 1883 and 1888; also copies of all deeds of transfer, &c., filed with the Government, in respect of the said steamer; also a statement of all sums paid during the said period of time for the service of the said steamer, with the names of the persons to whom the said sums were paid, and the dates of such payments.

He said: I would suggest that the Government should, as soon as possible, bring these papers down, because an enquiry is going on elsewhere in which they are involved.

Mr. BOWELL. There is but one contract in connection with this service, that is with Mr. Julien Chabot, dated November, 1883, and no other. There have been no deeds of transfer filed with the Government. The accounts in favour of the Intercolonial Railway for coal supplied to the steamer, repairs to steamer, and for back charges on freight and passengers, exceed the amount of the subsidy. The amount of the subsidy was, therefore, credited against these accounts, and the balance was paid over by Mr. Julien Chabot to the Intercolonial Railway. Whatever papers there are in connection with this matter will be brought down.

Motions agreed to.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE moved for:

1. Copies of the specifications prepared by the Government and which formed the basis of the call for tenders

for the work of constructing a drain from Lachine to Côte St. Paul, along the Lachine Canal; 2. Copies of all tenders filed for the said work, and of the reports of officers of the Department of Railways and Canals thereupon; 3. Copies of the report awarding the contract for the said work, and of the said contract.

Mr. BOWELL. The papers referred to will be brought down, but no contract has yet been entered into, owing to the town of Lachine not having yet complied with the terms it agreed to with the Government regarding the providing of the lands for the construction of that drain. As soon as the Department of Justice has reported upon the title for the land sent in by the corporation, a contract will be entered into and the work proceeded with. Meantime all papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM SAUNDERS AND Mr. MUTTART.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and orders relative to the dismissal of William Saunders and Mr. Muttart, section foremen of the Prince Edward Island Railway, in March or April last.

He said: I may say, in connection with this motion, that these two gentlemen have been section men on the Prince Edward Island Railway since the inauguration of that railway. As far as I know, these men have not been guilty of neglect of duty; and about two or three weeks after the elections in March last they were dismissed, and for what reason I am not aware. I do not know whether I will be able to get that information now, but I would like very much to get it. It appears that they must have been discharged under the impression that they had either canvassed or voted for the Liberal candidates. Well, I do not know how the Department of Railways has found that out. I believe the elections there are carried on under the ballot system, and I am not aware, unless certain gentlemen who were pretty busy on the day of the election were looking in through the windows or behind screens, how it could have been found out on which side these gentlemen voted. Admitting that they did vote for the Opposition candidate, is that a good reason for their dismissal? Is that the way the Railway Department is being managed? No wonder that the headship of that department has been going abegging these last two or three months. Is there no gentleman on that side competent to take control of that department? There ought to be a head to it, and we ought to be able to get the information we require. I do not admit that these gentlemen voted for the Opposition candidate, and I have no right to know how they voted. I saw these gentlemen every day during my campaign, and I am not aware that they attended one public meeting, nor am I aware that they canvassed any one for either party. Were they, then, dismissed to gratify the defeated Government candidates, in order to punish someone for their defeat? If a proper investigation was held, and it was found that these men had been derelict in their duty, of course I can have no objection to their dismissal. If there is no other reason given but that they voted for the Opposition candidate, it is a wrong principle. In Tignish, which is a mile from where I live, a gentleman went to work on the railway. He used to be a Liberal, but, by certain promises which the Conservatives made to him, he promised