

cial customs officer is dated 21st January, 1910.

GODERICH EXCISE COLLECTIONS.

Mr. BEATTIE:

1. What were the excise collections at Goderich, Ontario, for each of the past five years?

2. Who is the officer in charge, and where does he reside?

3. Is he employed in any other occupation than that of collector of inland revenue?

4. What was his salary at the date of his appointment, and what has his salary been each year since appointment?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1904-5.....	\$1,505 29
1905-6.....	943 71
1906-7.....	581 37
1907-8.....	755 09
1908-9.....	1,208 60

2. M. J. Dalton resides near Kingsbridge.

3. Not that the department is aware of.

4. Salary at appointment, \$800; 1905-6 at rate of \$800; 1906-7 at rate of \$800; 1907-8 at rate of \$800 for 11 months; \$1,000 for 1 month; 1908-9 at rate of \$1,000 for 1 month

LETHBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

Mr. MAGRATH:

What was the total revenue from the post office in the city of Lethbridge Alberta, for the ten months in the current fiscal year ending 31st January, 1910?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. \$22,994.78.

FISHING LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Have any claims been made upon the government of Canada for compensation to holders of licenses to fish, because of alleged interference with the enjoyment of the right covered by such licenses arising out of the dispute said to exist between the federal government and the government of the province of British Columbia?

2. If so, by whom have such claims been made and for what amount in each case?

3. Did Sir Wilfrid Laurier direct that written intimation should be sent to J. A. Kendall, of New Westminster, that all due consideration would be given to his claim?

4. Has such consideration been given? If so, with what result?

5. What was the date upon which intimation of due consideration was addressed to claimant named; and when, if at all, was the result of the promised consideration communicated to said claimant?

6. Does the federal government recognize responsibility for protection of holders of fishery licenses in the exercise of the rights conferred by these licenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes.

2. J. A. Kendall, \$850; W. Kendall, \$737.50.

3. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's private secretary, by direction, acknowledged the receipt of Mr. Kendall's letter in the usual formal way and stated that due consideration would be given it.

4. The Department of Marine and Fisheries had already dealt with the matter, and had informed Mr. Kendall that there did not appear to be any ground upon which it could favourably consider such a claim. No further facts being adduced by Mr. Kendall in support of his claim, the department had no reason for changing their opinion in the matter.

5. The formal acknowledgment above referred to was dated 30th April, 1909, but the Department of Marine and Fisheries had already, 14th January, 1909, declined favourable consideration of the claim.

6. The question is too general to be answered definitely. Any claim made against the federal government would be dealt with upon its merits.

FORT HENRY RESERVE.

Mr. M. CURRIE:

In what condition was the land on the Fort Henry Reserve, formerly leased to R. J. Dunlop, when the Department of Militia resumed possession?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. The land was in poor condition in that all fallen limbs of trees, etc., and underbrush had been allowed to lie, and the danger from fire was, consequently, very great. Also a fence which has been placed by Mr. Dunlop around the property was in a very dilapidated state and of little value. Several buildings, however, erected by Mr. Dunlop, viz:—a frame house; a frame barn and addition, and a small shack, were in fair condition.

CAMP BARRIEFIELD RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. M. CURRIE:

1. Did any one object to having the Rifle Ranges at Camp Barriefield, on the south side of the road, and were they consequently moved across the road, and new ranges erected at a cost of \$12,000?

2. If such objection was made, from whom did it emanate?

3. Why did the government build an embankment of earth back of the butts on the new range within 100 yards of the foot of a hill which rises 10 to 12 feet higher than the embankment?

Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. No one objected. The reasons why the range was changed from the south to the north side of the Gananoque road were amply sufficient. In the first place the old range was laid out by the imperial authorities some sixty or seventy years ago, at a time when the extreme range of the arms then in use was much less than at