

remains of the pier destroyed by the storm, and to place a triangular crib in its stead near the seaward end of the structure. Mr. Perley, in No. 56,874 of January 26th, states that to shorten the pier as above will be no disadvantage to the new channel, and that the structure will be so much the less liable to damage by storms. He, therefore, recommends that the permission asked for be granted.

“By a schedule attached to the papers, I find that payments were made as follows on this work:—

Cost of Superintendence of works up to 17th Feb., 1877. Angus McLeod, Clerk of Works, 1873-4. 185 days at \$3.00	\$555 00
In 1874-5, 313 days at \$3.00	939 00
In 1875-6, 202 “ “	606 00
6 months to 31st Dec., 1876, 140 days	420 00

\$2,520 00

“28th February, 1877.”

“I find by letter from Ross & McKay, dated Dec. 30, 1876, a claim for extras, to the amount of \$13,773.96.”

This was after the election, and when Ross was, no doubt, able to ask for this in consideration of his services in endeavouring to defeat Mr. Campbell a few weeks previously. The whole thing looked extremely bad.

“Under the circumstances this recommendation may probably be agreed to without detriment to the public interest. As regards the dredging, the contractors should be compelled to dredge the channel to the full width contemplated by contract No.4,319, viz:—200 feet.

“ S. T. BAILLAIRGÉ.”

On January 26th, 1876, Mr. Perley recommended that Ross & McKay be compelled to dredge the full width, as per terms of contract. Again, a schedule showed that the full amount of contract was paid Ross & McKay, viz:—\$78,208.60. He was, therefore, of opinion, from the above facts, taken from the official papers brought down from the Public Works Department, that he was justified in asking this House to vote for his amendment. He might also say that the Government had not brought down papers, asked for in this matter, namely, the Engineers' certificate of works done and payments made thereon at different dates.

MR. MACKENZIE said this was one of the most extraordinary motions he had ever known presented to Parliament. Without a moment's notice the

hon. gentleman moved a motion reciting what he was pleased to call facts, and charging the Government with having paid moneys to certain contractors improperly. It was utterly impossible for him (Mr. Mackenzie) at a moment's notice to recall circumstances which occurred years ago. The hon. gentleman knew that Mr. Perley, Chief Engineer of the Government, had been in attendance until eight or ten days ago for the express purpose of being ready to give information regarding this or other works, but he (Mr. McDonald) gave no notice of any sort of his intention to introduce this extraordinary motion, and came down and made a set of sweeping assertions with which it was impossible for him (Mr. Mackenzie) to deal, even if he were possessed of the best memory man ever had. His impression was that the works were overtaken when pretty well on by a severe storm, that a great portion was destroyed, and that the Engineer found it desirable to change the plans. To these changes, which were accepted by the Chief Engineer of the Government, he would, as a matter of course, give his consent. What those changes were he was unable at the moment to say. All he knew was that the contractors claimed that the Government were indebted to them to the amount of \$16,000 or thereabouts. Mr. Perley, whom he believed was one of the most upright officers that had ever served a Government, had reported against that claim. He had no reason to believe that Mr. Perley had ever given his certificate for the payment of money that was not justly due, and no payment had been made except upon that gentleman's certificate. No one could expect him to inform himself on matters of this kind without notice, and he had merely to say that he did not believe Mr. Perley ever gave improper certificates, or that the assertion that too much money was paid to the contractors was a fact. He asked the House to dispose of the motion by refusing assent to the one-sided statement the hon. gentleman had made.

MR. MACDONNELL said every hon. member required to know whether