

law would have the two-fold result of protecting the public and of rendering more agreeable the lives of those honest employees who suffer from this unfortunate state of affairs.

We hope that our suggestion will be taken into serious consideration by the Honourable the Postmaster General. In any case, we advise our readers to never send any money, not even the smallest sum, in a letter that is not registered or insured.

2. Is the Post Office Department aware that a law similar to that asked for in articles in question exists in France, and is as follows :

Are punishable with a fine of from 50 to 500 francs (Article 9 of the laws of the 4th June, 1859, and of the 25th January, 1873), 1st the inclosing of gold, of silver, of jewels and of other precious goods in correspondence ; 2nd, the inclosing of bank notes, bonds, cheques, coupons or dividends or interests due and payable to bearer, in letters that are not submitted to the formality of registration (*changement ou de la recommandation*) ?

3. If so is it the intention of the Post Office Department, for the better protection of the public in general and of the employees in particular, to have a law passed this session based upon that which now exists in France and in other foreign countries ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). My attention has, by this question, been called to the articles in question. The department is aware of the existence in France of such a law as is referred to in question 2, but understands that such a law does not exist in any other country. It is not in contemplation at the present time to introduce any legislation dealing with the matter.

WILLIAMSBURG AND CORNWALL CANALS— WATER POWER LEASES.

Mr. BRODER asked :

1. At what dates, and to whom, were the first water-power leases issued on the Williamsburg and Cornwall canals ?

2. At what yearly rent was each lease issued ?

3. Have any of these leases been transferred ? If so, to whom ?

4. Has the government made any claims under these leases for extra water used ?

5. If so, upon whom, and what amounts are claimed ?

6. Does the government intend to demand payment of such extra amounts ?

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

1, 2, 3. Williamsburg canals—

June 6th, 1853, to Wm. Elliott (cancelled and leased to W. C. Bailey et al, December 16th, 1871, and assigned to F. Beach, November 19th, 1883 ; rent, £35 per annum.

October 21st, 1861, to Benson & Aspeden (cancelled and leased to The Edwardsburg Starch Company, Limited, August 25th, 1894 ; rent, \$160 per annum.

February, 1852, to Benj. Chaffey (now Gibson & Company) ; \$246 per annum.

Cornwall canal :

February 29th, 1848, to Wm. D. Wood ; rent, £20 for the first run of mill stones and £10 for every other run of mill stones.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. The government is not aware of any extra amounts where additional water-power has been given ; it has always been the subject of a new lease, and the additional rentals in all such cases have been collected.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to some returns which were ordered some time ago and have not yet been laid on the table. I asked questions in regard to a railway station at Charlottetown in January last. The minister would not answer, but told me to ask for a return. I did so, and have been trying in vain to get it ever since. I asked also for a return showing the expenditure on railways and canals in each province, and in the return brought down, there is the statement by the minister that certain information could not be obtained. This seems very strange because I obtained a return in 1898 for similar expenditure up to that date, and I see no reason why the government should not be able to supplement that return by giving the information from 1898 down to the present. I would also bring to the notice of the Postmaster General a similar remissness on the part of his department. I asked for a return with regard to the additional subsidy given the province of Prince Edward Island in 1901 and have not yet got it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is true that my hon. friend has spoken to me on several occasions with respect to certain returns, and I have frequently brought his complaints to the attention of my deputy. My deputy has always assured me that he had applied to Moncton for that information but it had not been received. Only within the last day or two I spoke to him again and he assured me he would do everything possible to get the information at the earliest moment. I personally cannot attend to these matters and have to depend on my officials. I shall make a note of what my hon. friend says and see if I cannot spur them up. As regards the expenditure on railways and canals since 1898, I was under the impression that the return brought down gave all the information called for. I did not read the return but took it for granted that it furnished the information required. If my hon. friend will give me a memo. of what is lacking, I will have the matter looked up.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I shall give the hon. gentleman the memo.

Mr. EMMERSON. There certainly has been no information withheld intentionally. I cannot understand what possible reason