

will be no necessity to apply the American system to our procedure. My hon. friend says, very truly, that the practice lately introduced in this House, is in marked contrast to the practice of debate that prevails in the British House of Commons. But the adoption of the rule which my hon. friend suggests, the American rule, would not—

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not suggest that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps my hon. friend did not suggest that in so many words in his motion, but, as I understood his remarks, he had it in mind to adopt somewhat the American system of limiting speeches—

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I am the better pleased. Still, I cannot see that there is any reason, at this early period of the session, for trying to correct what was, no doubt, an evil. I think we can try this parliament and see how far the evil, which was so marked in last parliament, will prevail in this one. But, I may say to my hon. friend, that it is not out of place for parliament to revise its rules generally. For my part, I am prepared, and, indeed, I intend to see if the rules of the House cannot be modified somewhat. I am a strong believer in the British system of procedure, and I would only suggest that we should see how far we can adopt the rules which prevail in England. If I say, that, at an early date, I intend to call the attention of the House to this subject, perhaps my hon. friend will agree in the meantime, to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return of a certain report made in June, 1900, respecting Toronto Harbour by Engineers W. F. Jennings and Joseph R. Roy.—Mr. Kemp.

Return showing,—1. When J. R. Thompson was appointed an official of the Department of Interior, outside service.

2. His duties and salary.

3. Whether he ever acted in any other capacity than a homestead inspector, and if so, in what capacity or capacities, and for what length of time.

4. When he was dismissed. Date of notice of dismissal. At what date he would, if on duty as homestead inspector, probably have received it.

5. The date to which he was paid. If engaged by month, whether he was entitled to his pay up to the end of January, 1901? And if not, why not?

6. Whether it is not customary, in dismissing officials of several years' standing, to pay them a gratuity in proportion to their length of service? Whether it has been done in similar cases? If so, why not in his?

7. The cause of his dismissal.

8. What charges were made against him, and whether he was given an opportunity to reply to them?

9. Copy of notices issued by Mr. Burley.

10. Copy of Mr. Burley's instructions.

11. The name of the person at whose instance Mr. Burley issued such notices, and if on his own responsibility, whether Mr. Burley's action was approved or censured.

12. Whether it is customary for the Department of Interior to advertise for parties to come forward and make complaints against the officials of that department? If not, why was that course followed in this case?

13. The result of said investigation. Whether the investigation was adjourned to enable the complainant to secure evidence, and how long the investigation lasted?

14. Whether Thompson was ever notified of the finding of the investigation?

15. A copy of this notification.

16. The date of Mr. Burley's investigation and the date of his report.

17. Whether the files of the department in the case under investigation furnished the complainants.

17a. Whether it is customary in such cases to hand over the files of the department to the complainants?

18. Whether Mr. Thompson requested the department to furnish him certain papers on the files furnished the complainants as having any bearing on the complaint?

19. Whether he made this request more than once; if so, how many times did he do so? What reply was given him in each case?

20. The name of the party or parties appointed in his place?

21. The qualification of his successor or successors for the position?

22. His or their experience to qualify him or them for the said position, and of what has such experience consisted? At what date were such appointments made and on what recommendations?

23. At time of Thompson dismissal the amount of work on hand requiring attention by him or some one acting in the same capacity.

24. A comparative statement of the last two years of the duties performed by him and all the other homestead inspectors and forest rangers where the duties of both offices are performed by the one official.

25. The number of instructors made during the twelve months ending November 30 in years 1896-7-8-9 by all parties acting as homestead inspectors, and the number of days in each year they were employed making inspections. The number of days in each year they receive pay, and during the time they were under pay, what other duties as homestead inspectors were they engaged at? Also the number of applications for patents received by each during the same period, and the fees the department received for such applications?

26. The date when the charges were made against Thompson which were investigated by Mr. Burley?

27. The date of Mr. Burley's report.

28. Whether any further charges have been made?

29. If so, by whom, and their nature?

30. When Thompson was apprised of them and asked to disprove or reply to them?

31. Whether it is not the custom of the department to give all officials an opportunity to reply to any charges of insinuations against their conduct?

32. The duties of Mr. Burley prior to the investigation of charges against Mr. Thompson?

33. How long Mr. Burley has been in the employment of the Department of the Interior;