

2. If so, (a) who has the contract for the same, and (b) what is the amount to be expended?

3. Were tenders asked for said work? If so, who were asked to tender, and what were the amounts tendered, respectively?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Halifax Marine Engineering Co. has contract for repairs and renewals to machinery, \$16,750, and for new boilers, \$9,200; (b) T. Hogan & Co., Halifax, have contract for removal of old boilers, alterations to boiler room and installation of new boilers, \$9,841.

3. Yes, tenders were called by public advertisement for new engines and boilers, and the following tenders were received:

Supply of New Engine.

1. Bow McLachlin Co.	\$10,416 00
2. McKie & Baxter.	10,610 67
3. Polson Iron Works, Ltd.	12,244 00
4. The Jno. Inglis Co., Ltd.	12,500 00
5. The Halifax Engine Co., Ltd.*	14,300 00
6. Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.	14,000 00
7. The Chaudière Machine and Foundry Co.	15,750 00

* Alternative offer to install compound surface condensing engine to be supplied by department and fit propeller to shaft, department to pay for ship hire and dockage, connect piping from boilers, pumps, circulating pump suction and discharge to sea, remove present engine and stow as directed for \$13,600.

For repairs to old machinery.

1. The Halifax Marine Eng. Co., Ltd.	16,750 00
2. Burns & Kelleher.	17,200 00

Supply of new boilers.

1. The Halifax Marine and Engine Co., Ltd.	9,200 00
2. International Engineering Works, Ltd.	9,500 00
3. The Jenckes Machine Co., Ltd.	9,554 00
4. Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.	10,000 00
5. The Jno. Inglis Co., Ltd.	10,200 00
6. Polson Iron Works, Ltd.	10,936 00
7. The Chaudière Machine and Foundry Co.	18,500 00

Installation of new boilers.

1. The T. Hogan & Co.	9,841 00
2. Halifax Marine & Engineering Co.	14,550 00
3. A. A. Webber & Son.	14,700 00

ARTHUR GILBERT.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. Arthur Gilbert been collector of excise or an employee of the Inland Revenue Department at Victoriaville?

2. When was he appointed to such position?

3. Did he succeed a Mr. J. U. Poirier and was the latter dismissed?

4. What salary did Mr. Gilbert receive during each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

5. Had Mr. Gilbert an assistant at Victoriaville? If so, who was that assistant, and what was his salary?

6. What rent did the Government pay for Mr. Gilbert's office?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Yes.

2. July 19, 1912.

3. Yes. Mr. J. U. Poirier.

4. 1912, \$333.30; 1913, \$799.92; 1914, \$799.92.

5. No.

6. \$20, monthly rent.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all applications received for Fenian raid bounty from residents of the county of Hants; also the names of persons who have been paid the bounty and those who have been refused it in said county; with the reasons for refusal, and showing the number of applications that have yet been dealt with.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I desire to draw the attention of the House to a statement that appeared in the Toronto Globe of yesterday, which, to say the least of it, seems to me rather unfair. It reads as follows:

Early Prorogation to Hush Scandals?

Ottawa, March 29.—It looks as though the Government is now eager and determined to "close shop." It proposes, if possible, to crowd through remaining business and prorogue by the end of the present week. To do this it will be necessary to abandon the Easter adjournment and sit on Saturday. The Government notice providing for the Eastertide adjournment was formally put in, but since has been mysteriously withdrawn. Importance is attached to the new move to end Parliament as soon as possible by reason of the fact that prorogation would bring automatically a termination to the embarrassing investigations of the Public Accounts Committee, the special inquiry on soldier's boots and other investigations which threaten further serious disclosures.

The facts are that the Clerk of the House, following his usual practice, and without any special notification from any member of the Government, placed the usual notice on the Order Paper that when this House adjourns to-day it shall stand adjourned till next Tuesday. The first intimation I had of that notice being on the Order Paper was when hon. gentlemen opposite requested that it be withdrawn, and that we sit on Saturday, and on Monday and Tuesday of next week, in the hope of being able to conclude the business of the House within that time. Therefore I think it was rather unfair of the Globe to make the statement that