

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. and 2. The Department of Marine and Fisheries purchased a tug called the Murray Stewart to replace the lighthouse tender C.G.S. Lambton lost on Lake Superior in the spring of 1922, and for the additional purpose of being stationed at Georgian bay ports at the end of each season of navigation to render such assistance, in the event of ice formation, as may be necessary to enable vessels handling grain to move freely. The purchase price was \$80,000.

3. From the registered owner, James Frederick Martin Stewart of Toronto.

4. 1918—by the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, Limited.

5. (a) Gross tonnage 234.46. (b) Registered tonnage 92.25.

6. James Frederick Martin Stewart.

CARAQUET AND GULF SHORE RAILWAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the government completed the purchase of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway?

2. Has the purchase price been paid?

3. If not, what is the cause of the delay?

4. Have the claims of creditors of this company been satisfied?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. Yes; with the exception of \$550.

3. The Department of Railways and Canals, at the request of the Department of Justice, retained \$550 of the purchase price to protect the claim of the Post Office Department against the railway for loss of registered mail before the road was taken over.

4. One claim filed with the department was withdrawn; others were not considered valid.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER CANAL

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Referring to the following statement concerning the proposed St. Lawrence Power Canal, attributed to Charles P. Craig, Executive Director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in the Toronto Globe, of December 9:

"All further governmental action is impossible until Canada signifies its desire to enter into an agreement on the navigation project," Mr. Craig said. "I am vexed, but not disturbed, at the delay of Canada. There is no doubt in my mind but that Canada will act definitely within the next few days."

1. Is the statement of Mr. Craig correct?

2. What action, if any, has the government taken regarding the project since such statement was made?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I confess I do not quite understand what my right hon. friend is asking for. This question reads:

Referring to the following statement concerning the proposed St. Lawrence Power Canal, attributed to Charles P. Craig, Executive Director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in the Toronto Globe, of December 9:

[Mr. Graham.]

Then it quotes a statement and says—"Is the statement of Mr. Craig correct?" I notice the statement reads:

I am vexed, but not disturbed.

Is that the part of the question which the right hon. member wants answered?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first part Mr. Craig said, also.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question does not so read. If my right hon. friend will indicate just what information he wants, I shall be glad to give it to him; but I confess I do not know how to give it to him from these questions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The quotation is quite clear: It reads:

All further governmental action is impossible until Canada signifies its desire to enter into an agreement on the navigation project.

That is in quotation marks, followed by the words "Mr. Craig said." Then it goes on with Mr. Craig's remarks:

I am vexed, but not disturbed, at the delay of Canada. There is no doubt in my mind but that Canada will act definitely within the next few days.

What I desire to know is: Are his remarks correct? Is all further governmental action impossible until Canada signifies its desire, and is it, no doubt, correct that Canada will act definitely within the next few days?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think, to the first part of the question, as my right hon. friend has just put it, I might answer, No. To the latter part, as well, I might answer, No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right. Of course, with the exception of the first part, this question cannot be considered answered, the second part still remains unanswered.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards the second question: Since the statement was made, a deputation waited on the government, on the 24th January, making certain representations concerning the deep waterways project, and the government mentioned at the time that their representations would be taken into consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No action?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Nothing further at present.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES AND BONUS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is it the intention of the government to inaugurate a general revision of the Civil Service salaries?

2. If so, will Parliament be informed, and when?

3. Will such revision incorporate existing bonuses with present salaries?