

it back to the committee if we have no facts before us to justify us in restoring what the committee struck out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the point raised by my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is well taken, and I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

Mr. TURRIFF moved that the order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 165) respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 173) respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 164) to incorporate the Monarch Bank of Canada.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 182) to incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

QUESTIONS.

SASKATCHEWAN LAND COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What official or officials of the department authorized, or made the issue of, the patents to the Saskatchewan Land Company, on evidence of homestead entries instead of actual settlement, as stated by Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, as recorded in 'Hansard' of 1904, page 7046, as follows: Mr. Clancy—Was it done on his recommendation? Mr. Sifton—No. Mr. Clancy—If the deputy did not recommend it, who did? Mr. Sifton—We will make careful search and find out exactly how the transaction took place. And also on page 7050, as follows: Mr. Sifton—I presume they referred to homestead entries as sufficient evidence. I was not willing to act upon that, but subsequently the officers issued the patents on Mr. McConnell's report.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Patents to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company were issued by the Chief Clerk of Patents Branch on the authority of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, and were signed by the deputy Minister of the Interior, the Under Secretary of State, and the deputy governor. The land so patented was sold to the company with conditions of settlement.

SECRETARY OF STATE REPORT.

Mr. BELCOURT asked:

1. What was the number of employees in the Department of the Secretary of State on December 31, 1894, and on December 31, 1904, respectively?

2. What was the total amount paid to the staff of such department in each of the fiscal

Mr. TISDALE.

years covering the said dates, including as well the salaries of the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State?

3. What was the total revenue of the said department for those years respectively?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. December 31, 1894, 39; December 31, 1904, 29.

2. 1894-1895, \$51,758.18; 1904-1905, \$47,645.85.

3. 1894-1895, \$5,763.95; 1904-1905, \$65,590.80.

PORT BURWELL DREDGING.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Who has the dredging contract at Port Burwell?

2. When was the contract given, and was it let after public competition?

3. Who are the contractors, and at what price?

4. How many tenders were received, and what was the amount of each tender?

5. Has the government made any advance for purchasing the dredge now being used at Port Burwell? If so, what amount?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. The Dominion Dredging and Construction Company.

2. Contract not yet signed; yes.

3. The Dominion Dredging and Construction Company; (b) 14½ cents per cubic yard.

4. Five tenders were received:

	Per cubic yard.
A.	14½ cents.
B.	16 "
C.	17 "
D.	18½ "
E.	20¼ "

5. No.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Referring to a report of the secretaries of the Lord's Day Alliance, published in the 'Lord's Day Advocate' of June, 1905, setting forth an interview had with the Minister of Justice on the 9th of May last, and containing the following paragraph: 'We were much pleased further, to be assured by Mr. Fitzpatrick that, should the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decide that the Dominion parliament has jurisdiction to legislate upon the Sunday question, and not the provincial legislatures, we could rely upon having his loyal support for the enactment of such legislation as we had indicated in our draft Bill. You will find me, he said, solidly with you in this matter;' 1. Did the Minister of Justice give the assurance and make the statement above set out?

2. If so, was the minister then speaking for the government, or for himself only?

3. Has the government, as a matter of fact, determined upon the course of action outlined by the Minister of Justice as above stated?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I had several conversations, the exact tenor of which I do not now