

departments which it concerns. If any possible and reasonable regulation can be made, by which delays and inconvenience of this kind may be prevented without detriment to the public interest, I need hardly assure the House that we will be very glad indeed to have such regulation put in force.

Mr. EMMERSON: I thank the Prime Minister for his assurance that the subject will have the consideration of himself and of the heads of the different departments. I do not think the Minister of Marine and

4 p.m. Fisheries quite recognized the gravity of the case. It is true no great damage resulted, and no doubt Mr. Colpitts, like any other sturdy New Brunswicker, would be quite disposed to take the brunt of such hardships as he experienced, but this case involves a principle which should be dear to every Canadian, and that is, the liberty of the subject. I am not bringing any charges against officials, neither am I condemning the Government nor the departments concerned, nor the regulations, but it seems to me in view of all that has been said, and particularly in view of what was stated by the Minister of Customs, that there has been a manifest misinterpretation of the regulation. A regulation designed to protect this country in the matter of immigrants, has been read to include Canadians returning to Canada by third-class passage, and that, I think, was never intended. It is apparent on the face of it, and particularly from the letter of the purser of the steamship *Empress of Britain*, that the interpretation put upon that regulation is that under no circumstances shall a third-class passenger be permitted to land at Rimouski. The Minister of Marine referred to a letter written on the 29th of March, 1912, by Mr. McDougald, in which Mr. McDougald states:

I am advised by the Director General of Public Health as follows: the best course for a passenger under the circumstances narrated by Mr. Colpitts would be, after arranging with the ship's officers and getting his luggage prepared, to give his name and state his desire to land to the quarantine officer when that official is preparing the clearance for the ship and making out the nominal roll of the customs clearance for those who are landed at Rimouski.

Under the evidence presented, Mr. Colpitts did that very thing, and the answer given to him was: no third-class passenger can land at Rimouski. This also is apparent from the instructions given by the Canadian Pacific railway and other steamship companies to their officials, and that is

what I want the Government to inquire into. Surely that regulation is not intended to apply to Canadian citizens, surely it was never contemplated that a young man returning to his Canadian home in that way, should be prohibited from taking advantage of landing at Rimouski. I ask the Government to provide that in future every Canadian citizen whether he travels first-class, second-class, or third-class, shall have the privilege of landing at Rimouski if he so desires.

Motion agreed to.

THE KING VS. FALARDEAU.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and documents generally concerning the withdrawal of an appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of His Majesty the King, appellant, and Alfred Olivier Falardeau and Constant Napoleon Falardeau, respondents.

He said: I regret that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General are in their seats now, but I suppose the Postmaster General who is familiar with the facts of this case, as a resident of Quebec, will be able to give me the information I seek.

The facts are the following: As you are aware, the construction of the National Transcontinental railway necessitated the expropriation of lands in and around the city of Quebec. Not far from the bridge, but between the site where the bridge is ultimately to be built and the city of Quebec, there is a property owned by Alfred Olivier Falardeau and Constant Napoleon Falardeau. As that property was required for the right of way of the said National Transcontinental railway, expropriation proceedings were taken by the Crown, the information being filed in court in due form on the 2nd day of October, 1911. The information was filed by the predecessor of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, Sir Allen B. Aylesworth; and, as is usual in such proceedings, the Crown made an offer for the lands which were to be expropriated. These lands were described as follows:

A parcel of land being part of lot number 260 on the official cadastre and book of reference thereto for the parish of Sillery, in the county of Quebec, covering an area of 328,552 square feet, more or less, being a strip of fifty feet in width on each side of the central line of the Transcontinental as far as Champlain street to the east of said lot 260, bounded to the northeast by lot 232, to the southwest by lot 261, to the northwest partly by Champlain street and partly by the balance of lot 260, and to the southeast by the southeastern limit