

## Questions

4. Is she entitled to the preference given by section 39 of the Civil Service Act to those who have military service overseas in the late war, or to the widows of such?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.
2. \$3,000.
- 3.

1919-20 . . . . .	\$1,123 65
1920-21 . . . . .	1,636 51
1921-22 . . . . .	1,404 26
1922-23 . . . . .	862 08
1923-24 to Sept. 30, 1923 . . . . .	856 27
*Oct. 1, 1923 to March 31, 1924 . . . . .	1,139 23
*1924-25 . . . . .	280 28

4. No, (she was appointed prior to the passing of this section), but she is a widow whose only son was killed in action in 1915.

\*Attached for special duty to Department of Immigration and Colonization.

## MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 10—COAL INQUIRY

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. How many officers have been dismissed for participation in the frauds disclosed by the Campbell commission in connection with the sale of coal?
2. How many non-commissioned officers?
3. How many privates?
4. How many workmen?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): None. The government has taken steps to court martial Lt.-Col. G. F. C. Pousette, District Supply and Transport Officer, who was primarily responsible for the receipt of coal at the military establishment at Winnipeg. The question of dismissing and disciplining officers, privates and workmen is under consideration.

## CONSUMERS GLASS COMPANY

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the government aware that the Consumers Glass Company of Verdun, through its superintendent, Mr. Goddard, brought workmen between the 20th and 25th February, 1925, from Zanesville, Ohio, where the trade union is not recognized, and that these strike breakers have replaced citizens of Canada in said Consumers Glass factory?
2. Is the government in a position to inform the House if the men named Crest and Millar at present registered at Dombrio hotel, as well as their companions, have not violated the Immigration Act by entering Canada?
3. If they have unlawfully entered Canada, is it the intention of the government to deport them?
4. Is it true that said Consumers Glass Company unlawfully employ young girls between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. and even on Sunday?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. No information.
2. The Department of Immigration and Colonization has no record of Crest and Millar and unless furnished with the names of their companions can make no reply with respect to the latter.

[Mr. Doucet.]

3. If it is shown that these men effected illegal entry to Canada, the Department of Immigration and Colonization will institute deportation proceedings.

4. No information.

## HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY—LAND

Mr. GOOD:

1. During the last ten years has the Hudson's Bay Company been granted any land?
2. If so, (a) How much; (b) Where situated; (c) For what consideration; (d) For what reasons?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.
2. (a) 98,059.94 acres.
- (b) Prairie provinces and Northwest Territories.
- (c) Deed of surrender, Dominion Lands Act, exchange account and by purchase under clause 32 of Dominion Lands Act.
- (d) 693.74 acres—Trading post under deed of surrender.
- 42,836.27 acres—Notifications and allotments of 1/20th.
- 54,156.50 acres—Exchange account.
- 373.43 acres—Sales for trading post under section 32 of the Dominion Lands Act.—\$1,746.26.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

## VANCOUVER WATERFRONT PROPERTY

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How much did the Vancouver Board of Harbour Commissioners pay for the waterfront property lying immediately east of and adjoining No. 1 harbour board elevator, portion of which is now occupied by elevator known as Spillers elevator?
2. What was the total area of the said property: (a) Above high water mark; (b) Below high water mark?
3. Was the said property offered to the harbour board for \$275,000?
4. Did the said price of \$275,000 include a sawmill and buildings then on the property?
5. Did the harbour board secure an option at this price and if so, for how long?
6. Subsequent to the purchase of the said property, did the harbour commissioners permit the former owners to remove the mill and other buildings, or to whom was the said mill sold, or given, or released?
7. Was a portion of the said property leased to R. H. Gale of Vancouver, acting for himself or a company, and if the latter, what was the name of the company to whom the lease was issued?
8. Did the said R. H. Gale negotiate the said lease?
9. Has there been any transfer of the said lease since the original issue? If so, to whom?
10. What is the amount of rental being paid to the harbour commissioners for the said lease?
11. Did the harbour commissioners undertake to build a jetty for grain conveyors as a condition or term in the said lease? If so, what has the said jetty and conveyors and equipment cost?