

EMPLOYMENT OF MAURICE ARCAND.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Was or is Maurice Arcand in the employ of the Department of Public Works in connection with the construction of the coal dock at the city of Three Rivers, Quebec?

2. If so, what is or was the nature of his employment and what salary was or is he paid?

3. Is it the intention of the department to dispense with the services of the said Maurice Arcand? If so, has he been notified to that effect?

4. If his services are dispensed with, will his successor be one Edmond Michelin, of Three Rivers?

5. If so, what is Michelin's age, and what has his former occupation or trade been?

Mr. ROGERS: I am unable to give the information at the moment. We telegraphed to the engineer in charge at Three Rivers but his reply has not yet been received.

Mr. BUREAU: I would ask that the question stand until the reply has been received.

Question stands.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a return showing what officers and men were employed on the dredge Northumberland at Pictou in the months of January, February and March, 1913, and what salaries and wages were paid to them respectively; what amounts were paid for repairs and supplies respectively, for said dredge during said months and to whom were they paid respectively.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a return showing the full names of the mail carriers in the county of Vaudreuil and Soulanges; between what places they perform the service; what the distance each of these places is; what the amount of each carrier's contract is; what amount the Government paid for the carriage of the mail in these different places before September, 1911.—Mr. Boyer.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. BELAND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the explanations supplied by hon. members who were present last night when the vote was taken regarding their abstention from voting is not recorded in 'Hansard.' I would like to know if any instructions have been made to the reporters not to enter these explanations. I see that on the 15th of March last on three different votes hon. members explained that they had refrained from voting because they were paired, and their explanations were recorded. It is the only way in which members who exchange the favour of pairing with their fellow-members can show that they were present when the vote was taken, and I do not

Mr. PELLETIER.

see why it should be omitted from 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no rule with regard to pairs or pairing, but I think the general custom has been that when an announcement of a pair is made in the House it is taken note of by the 'Hansard' reporter. So far as I know, there never have been any instructions given during my time as Speaker, regarding that matter. It has been the custom to publish in 'Hansard' the announcement as to pairs.

Mr. BORDEN: The hon. member (Mr. Beland) is quite right. It always has been the custom to insert in 'Hansard' the explanation given by hon. members as to pairs, and I have no idea as to why it was omitted in this case. I did not know it had been omitted until the hon. gentleman brought it to the attention of the House.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): I rise to a question of privilege. In this morning's Montreal Gazette, reporting the proceedings of yesterday, there is a statement as to which I desire to enter my most emphatic protest and denial. Speaking of the closure vote, the Montreal Gazette says:

All the Quebec members present voted with the Government.

As a Quebec member present, I want to deny most emphatically that I voted with the Government on that question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

QUESTION OF PROCEDURE.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to the recent debate on the motion to amend the rules of the House, lest it might be at some time in the future quoted as a precedent, I wish to point out that Mr. Kay, who moved the adjournment of the debate on April 16, afterwards in the same speech moved the adjournment of the House, which, of course, would not be regular or permissible; but it passed unnoticed at the time. I mention it so that there may be no misunderstanding in the future.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I be permitted to say that the member who moved the adjournment of the debate, in my humble judgment, had afterwards the privilege of moving the adjournment of the House? I do not know that because he was speaking to one motion he could not move another.

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member cannot make two motions in one speech, and when he moved the adjournment of the debate he would be considered as having spoken had he not availed himself of the privilege when the time came to speak. Had he not risen to speak after moving the adjournment of the debate, he would be listed as a member who had spoken on the question.