

being the lowest was accepted. His sureties are John McMorine and James Ogle Ginn.

4. The former contractor was A. E. Main, his contract price being \$80 per annum.

POST OFFICE, LENNOXVILLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Is it the intention of the government to provide a post office in the village of Lennoxville, suitable to the requirements of the place? If so, when?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). Matter under consideration.

EXPENDITURE ON LAMBERT'S PIER, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked :

1. Was the sum of \$11,246.81, appearing on page 16, part 2, of the Report of the Minister of Public Works for the year 1904, as having been expended on Lambert's pier, in Prince Edward Island, paid for work actually performed?

2. By whom was the work performed, and when?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. It is through a clerical error that the sum of \$11,246.81 appears as having been expended in connection with Lambert's pier, P.E.I.

2. There was no expenditure incurred in connection with that pier, during the fiscal year 1903-4.

The statement in Public Works Report showing the above \$11,246.81 opposite Lambert's pier is simply the addition of the preceding figures under the title of 'Prince Edward Island.'

PAYMENTS TO LOGBERG PRINTING COMPANY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What is the total amount paid to the Logberg Printing Company, Winnipeg, during each year since January 1st, 1898, to 1st January, 1905, by all the departments of this government?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Payments made through Department of the Interior :

| | |
|--------------|------------|
| 1898.. . . . | \$1,222 25 |
| 1899.. . . . | 2,345 70 |
| 1900.. . . . | 2,899 45 |
| 1901.. . . . | 2,260 00 |
| 1902.. . . . | 2,354 40 |
| 1903.. . . . | 2,366 14 |
| 1904.. . . . | 2,381 78 |

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Amount paid by the Post Office Department to the Logberg Printing Company, Winnipeg, during each year since 1st of January, 1898, to 1st of January, 1905:-

| | |
|--------------|---------|
| 1898.. . . . | \$17 40 |
| 1899.. . . . | 7 90 |
| 1901.. . . . | 14 62 |
| 1902.. . . . | 9 88 |
| 1903.. . . . | 21 32 |
| 1904.. . . . | 10 40 |

Total.. . . . \$81 52

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the Prime Minister if the answers given are in full. I see the question calls for payments made by all the departments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two answers, one by the Post Office Department and one by the Department of the Interior. I have not the other departments.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the question may stand until the balance comes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think if the hon. member for Marquette were here he would think that he had reached the object of his question, which was chiefly concerned with the Department of the Interior. But I have no objection to letting the question stand.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER OF WHEATLEY RIVER.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Was James Power, postmaster at Wheatley River, Prince Edward Island, dismissed from office? If so, on whose recommendation, and for what cause?

2. Were any charges for inefficiency or otherwise made against him?

3. Who is his successor, and who recommended his appointment?

4. What was the date of the appointment to office of James Power, and what was the date of his dismissal?

5. Did the Governor in Council, or the Postmaster General, receive any petition or petitions for the reinstatement of the said James Power?

6. What action, if any, has been taken on said petitions?

7. Has any inquiry into the matter been ordered, or is any in contemplation?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). On the 12th January, 1905, the department decided to remove Mr. James Power from the position of postmaster at Wheatley River which office he had held since prior to 1873, the reason for his removal being that during the last Dominion election he had proved himself an active, offensive, political partisan, among other things taking part in public speaking on behalf of one of the candidates, and otherwise acting throughout the campaign as a political partisan. On the 1st of February a petition was received at the department asking for his retention, but the request was not acceded to, some weeks before the postmaster having been notified of his dismissal. Action was based upon reliable information as to the accuracy of the charges and no further inquiry into the matter is considered necessary.