and whether they have taken any steps in consequence of that information; and if so, what steps?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not in the public interest that any reply should be given to this question.

WHARVES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair, during the present season, the wharf at West Point, Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to do so during the present season.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take charge of the Cascumpec Wharf, Prince Edward Island, and to repair the same during the present season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to take charge of that wharf, inasmuch as there is one not far from it which is under the charge of the Government.

WHARF AT ST. FRANÇOIS.

Mr. LANGELIER, Montmorency, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue during the present year the works already initiated for the construction of a wharf in the Parish of St. François, in the Island of Orleans?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give an affirmative answer to the hon. member to-day.

DOCUMENTS ON THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay before the House the correspondence which has taken place in relation to the Fishery question, as well between the Canadian and British Governments, and between the British Government and the Government of the United States; and if so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. The correspondence referred to will be laid before the House on Friday, I hope—on Monday at the latest.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before the House copies of instructions given to commanders of vessels for the protection of the Fisheries, as well during the past season as the present one; and if so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention that copies of these instructions, issued as well during the past season as the present one, so far as given to date, shall be brought down, and form part of the correspondence referred to in the preceding question.

SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS ON THE PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before the House the correspondence in relation to the seizure of British vessels in Behring's Sea and other places on the Pacific coast by an armed United States vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. This correspondence is being prepared, and will be laid before the House at as early a day as possible.

SALARIES OF REVISING OFFICERS.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the salary of Revising Officers yet been fixed by Order in Council? If so, when, and at what figure?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The salary has not yet been fixed.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Have any sums of money been paid to Revising Officers in advance of their salaries on work performed by them? If so, what amount up to the present date?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would refer my hon. friend to the report of the Auditor General, page 1795, I think. To the 11th April the sum of $44,000 has been paid on account of the salaries of revising officers.

DISMISSAL OF ODIAS CARBONNEAU, EUDORE GAUMONT AND FIDÈLE PELLETIER.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all papers, documents, &c., respecting the dismissal of Odias Carbonneau, Eudore Gaumont and Fidèle Pelletier, all three employed on the Intercolonial Railway: the first as telegraph operator at the Chaudière, County of Levis, the second as a section man at St. Thomas, County of Montmagny, and the third as station master at Cap St Ignace, County of Montmagny.

He said: In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to make a few remarks with regard to these three dismissals, as I would like to know the circumstances under which and the reasons why they were made. These dismissals were made under rather extraordinary circumstances, some of them within a few days, others within a few weeks after the polling day during the last elections. My attention was more especially called to them by the fact that the newspapers published a correspondence containing a letter from the hon. Minister of Public Works which contradicted, to a certain extent, a letter from the Minister of Railways which I have in my possession, and which was addressed to my opponent, Mr. Landry, some time before polling day. As regards Mr. Carbonneau, I will suppose for the moment that he was dismissed for cause. If he was dismissed for cause, then I ask what was the reason which caused him to be reinstated a few days before the votation during the last elections. A few details will give you a better idea of the long and short of these dismissals. In the first place, I see in *Le Canadien* of the 11th of April instant, under the signature of P. Landry, a correspondence mentioning a letter from Mr. McDonald dismissing Mr. Carbonneau, and bearing date the 31st of July, 1886, the reason stated in that letter being that he had absented himself from his office for a few hours and that he had previously been guilty of offences of the same nature. Later on, Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of November, 1886, I see a letter from Mr. Pottinger addressed to my opponent, Mr. Philippe Landry, and containing the following words:

"As regards O. Carbonneau, telegraph operator, concerning whom you wrote to me quite a while ago, it is impossible for me to do anything for him, for the simple reason that he was dismissed after a minute investigation of his case, referred to me by Mr. McDonald, and then by me to the Department. The neglect for which he was dismissed was not his first fault"

Now, on the 6th of December, 1886, I find a letter signed "Hector L. Langevin" which is, I suppose, the signature of the Hon. Minister of Public Works, in answer to Mr. Landry, and containing the following:—

"I have received your letter of the 2nd December transmitting to me the letter of Mr. O. Carbonneau, of Montmagny, and requesting me to interfere in order to have him reinstated. If I thought Mr. Carbonneau would stand any chance of being reinstated, I would speak about it to the Minister of Railways, but really I do not see any chance in that quarter It is true there has been no accidents, but the operator was doubly at fault. He should not have left his post, or if he left it he should have made sure that somebody was left in his place.

"I do not like to suppose that the reason why he absented himself is not the reason given by him, but all appearances are against him, and I know that in a similar case the Minister of Railways refused to re-appoint the operator."

Here then, Mr. Speaker, are three letters dated before the elections, in 1886, stating that Mr. Carbonneau was dis-