

these political associations. It has W. J. McKee at its head, a well known politician. There was another tender put in by this so-called Grant Company afterwards, on the 20th May. I am not going to deal with the question of the frauds perpetrated by the unloading of the scows. The evidence given in the committee is so clear that the dishonesty cannot be doubted. Wilkinson, the master of the Mackay dredge, when confronted with the statement which shows that his dredge was employed sixteen hours frankly said that he did not believe the inspector was there, and that the inspector did not know how many scow loads were taken out and whether the scows were full. In the locality it is well known the inspector was not there. I am glad the minister is now taking some precaution by compelling the inspectors to sign a form of declaration. The minister and the Liberal press took great credit from the fact that by refusing to renew the contract and inviting new tenders the country had lost money. What has been the result? In the work at Midland the price paid is 2 cents a yard more. But that is no fault of mine. If the minister thought that the former price was fair, why did he pay a higher price? He could have got the work done at the same rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After asking for tenders we let the contract to the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister knew that they had done the work the previous year at 26 cents, and he has himself to blame if anything more was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not throw the responsibility of accepting the lowest tender on any one.

Mr. BENNETT. If he has succeeded in making the country pay a couple of hundred thousands of dollars more for dredging this year, that is no fault of mine. Parliament voted a certain amount of money for dredging operations; yet in the face of the direct appropriation by parliament the Mackay-Grant Company did work that amounts to \$75,000 more than the appropriation, and the minister had to come down with a vote for that amount. Does he propose to do that this year again? Is he going to ask for an appropriation and then let the contractors exceed it to the extent of \$75,000 or \$100,000? I quite agree that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are both doing a large amount of work at Victoria harbour and Clifton and that dredging is required at both these points, but I want to see the country get good value. I do not object to the expenditure; but when contractors put in tenders which are fraudulent on their face, the department should act with them in a summary manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year it was found that the appropriation was exceeded before the close of the season. There was very important work being done by both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway with a view of getting the harbour ready by the time their railway tracks reached these ports; and I thought it would be a public misfortune if I were obliged to close down the dredging work before the end of the season. And while, under the contracts, I might have done so, I said they might go on with the work, they taking the risk of the appropriation being made by parliament. I am happy to say that when parliament was asked to make an appropriation in the supplementary estimates of the last fiscal year there was a ready response, no objection being raised. With regard to this year's work, I think that in the supplementary estimates there will be found a sufficient vote to enable the dredges to work during the whole of the present season. It may be that some work will be done beyond the appropriation, but I have reason to believe that the appropriation will be quite sufficient.

Now, with regard to the company with which Mr. Mackay was connected, I do not know why it was that that company did not tender for the work of Tiffin and Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me set the minister right at the outset, for I am sure he does not wish to misstate the case. No tenders were called at the commencement of the year for Tiffin. I have the advertisement and the hon. gentleman will see that the dredging was at Midland.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present, we distinguish between Midland and Tiffin, but we did not at that time. The reason why Tiffin was included in Midland last year was that it forms part of Midland Bay, or even Midland harbour, although the new terminals of the railway company are being made in a very different place from the terminals at Midland. Now, my hon. friend, I think, would have achieved great eminence if he had adopted a different profession. His abilities, certainly, would have adorned the profession which was made famous by the celebrated Sherlock Holmes. Even in the matter of the comparison of handwriting, my hon. friend is able to see with absolute certainty resemblances in the handwriting of different documents which nobody else is able to discover. Take the tenders for Penetanguishene and Owen Sound and my hon. friend can see resemblances in the figures written in these two tenders, which, I am positive, no other hon. member of this House or anybody else will be able to see. I have looked at the two, and while I admit that there is some