

2. Does the lease specify all such surplus water?

3. When does this lease expire?

4. What return is the government getting for this privilege?

5. Who are the present lessees?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1-2-3. The lease on the Lachine canal, to William Parkyn, dated 4th of August, 1860, demised to the lessee, his executors, administrators and assigns, the use and enjoyment of the entire surplus water disposable, arising and flowing from the level of the Lachine canal at and above the St. Paul's lock, being number four of the said canal, from the first day of February, 1853, for the term of 21 years, renewable for a second term of 21 years, and for a third term of 21 years, and so on for ever, subject to the conditions contained in the lease. It is a question of law as to whether the lease is legally in existence.

4. The government is getting in return for this privilege (together with certain lands also leased under the said lease) the yearly rental of \$1,601.

5. The department is informed that the St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Company, Limited, as successors of the estate of John Frothingham, are the owners of the rights granted by the Crown under the lease.

#### SACKVILLE RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Have any tenders been asked for the erection of a new railway station-house at Sackville, New Brunswick?

2. Is it the intention of the Railway Department to erect a new railway station at that point?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No.

2. It is the intention of the department to erect a new railway station at Sackville.

#### KINGSTON, NEW BRUNSWICK—JUBILEE STATION MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Have tenders been asked for the carriage of the mails from Kingston, King's county, to Jubilee Station, Intercolonial Railway?

2. If not, has old contract been renewed?

3. If renewed, what is the present rate of pay for the service?

4. What amount was paid the carrier under the old contract?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The contract for this service was let by tender in 1901 at \$199.50 per annum. The contract contains the following clause: 'It being agreed and understood, however, that in case the Postmaster General makes any change or changes by way either of increase or decrease in the services which the contractor hereby agrees to perform, a corresponding rateable increase or decrease

as the case may be shall be made in the amount to be paid the contractor, the amount of such increase or decrease to be fixed and finally declared by the accountant of the Post Office Department.' In October, 1904, the Reed's Point post office was removed to another site, the change increasing the distance to be travelled by the contractor, and he thereupon became entitled to be paid a pro rata increase of his contract price which increase amounted to \$16.62 per annum, making the amount payable to him under contract for the service, \$216.12. This contract expired on the 31st March, 1905, and was renewed with the same contractor at the same sum, namely, \$216.12, tenders not having been invited.

#### TRADING STAMPS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the government orders are proceeded with, might I ask my right hon. friend if the government has given consideration to the demand laid before it by a very influential deputation from Montreal for legislation regarding the use of trading stamps? The session is pretty far advanced, and many of those who take an interest in that question are anxious to know whether the government are going to take any steps to abate the evil, which continues to exist.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All I can say to my hon. friend is that at this moment this matter is under the consideration of the government, but we have come to no conclusion yet.

#### THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). I would like to ask if the Postmaster General has taken into consideration the difficulties under which members labour in connection with the franking of the papers which they send out. By the last decision they have been deprived of the use of a stamp. I am aware that it was decided some time ago that members should put their frank on every document they sent out, but I do not think that the members fully considered the great inconvenience that would entail. Many of us have several thousand documents to send out, and we are not permitted to employ any one else to do the work. If we were required only to frank our letters, that would not be much of a hardship, but when we have to frank all the papers and documents that we send out, it becomes a great hardship. I hope the Postmaster General will give the matter his consideration, and permit the use of a stamp so far as documents are concerned.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before the Postmaster General addresses the House, might I offer a suggestion? I understood that the objection was to the misuse of the initials of a member by means of a stamp. Would it not