

2. The almost unlimited number of men allowed on the said work, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

Now, that statement of fact is an abstract of the evidence simply. It is not the judge's opinion. It is merely an abstract of the evidence, and I have carefully compared the evidence with the judge's statement, and I found it to be correct.

But, Sir, what I want to ask the House is: Was that wrongful contract made by some subordinate in the department for whom the Minister could hardly be held responsible, or, was it made by the Minister himself? The hon. the Minister felt that it was wrong. As he said himself, in his speech last session, he objected to it for a long time. He called his deputy and talked it over with him; He called Mr. St. Louis and talked it over with him, and then not only did the Minister agree to the contract, but he agreed to it after full reflection and after full discussion. Therefore, he must be held to be personally responsible. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we then find? Who is this man to whom the Government gave the contract? The evidence has proved conclusively that he is a very strong partisan of the present Government, and has been accustomed for years to contribute to their election expenses. This man, as it appears, destroyed his books, because, as he swears himself if he had produced the books, they would have shown how much money he has contributed from time to time towards the election expenses of gentlemen supporting the Government. During the very time this contract was under way, and when he was receiving these extravagant sums for labour he was supplying, he (St. Louis) swears that he contributed an amount which he won't mention, but which his books would have shown had they been produced, towards an election contest in Vaudreuil.

Now, what did the Government do next? They had a gentleman in connection with that work, who was connected with it from its inception, and whose name was Desbarats. Mr. Desbarats, as the report shows, was sent to Montreal in September, 1892, to examine the site of the bridges. The first plan was prepared by Mr. Desbarats under Mr. Trudeau, late Deputy Minister, and the second and third plans were prepared in Montreal by Mr. Desbarats and Mr. Parent. Mr. Desbarats remained in Montreal from November till 1st of March. Mr. Desbarats was dismissed, and why? There was no living public official in a position so thoroughly to understand those works as Mr. Desbarats. He had prepared the original plans, he had prepared the extensions, he was in a position to check them, but Mr. Desbarats had done that which was an unpardonable sin; he had interfered with the politicians who were connected with the construction of this

bridge. We had here a Mr. Kennedy, a political supporter of the Government, a protege and friend of the Solicitor General, a gentleman who was appointed to his position as superintendent of the canal at the instance of the Solicitor General and Mr. Ogilvie, and a Senator whose name I forget.

An hon. MEMBER. Senator Drummond.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, Senator Drummond, Mr. Ogilvie and Solicitor General Curran had Kennedy appointed to the position. Mr. Kennedy thought he was going to have a free-hand, to run matters as he liked, to spend what he liked, and to distribute the ill-gotten gains which were to come out of that bridge as he liked; and Mr. Desbarats, as I say, committed the unpardonable sin of attempting to keep a check upon Mr. Kennedy. What are the facts? We find in the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee that on the 4th February, 1893, Mr. Kennedy, superintendent of the canal, writes a letter to the chief engineer, warning him that he (Kennedy) is in no way to be interfered with, warning him that Desbarats, the local engineer in charge, had been keeping the time of the men, and going to the time-keepers to get the time so that he might compare it with his own time and see if it was correct. And Mr. Kennedy wanted no check kept upon the time. He was going to be the absolute and uncontrolled ruler, or, as he termed it himself, "boss of that job." In this letter, which he writes on this date to the chief engineer, he said:

I will also call your attention to the fact that the resident engineer, Mr. Desbarats, solicits his information personally from foremen or others appointed by me, in their different capacities. I here now inform you, that from this date, when he requires any information, or has any orders to give or issue, they will have to be given or come direct through me, who have up to the present mapped out the programme of the work. Furthermore, I will issue orders to my men that any information or any orders received, save through me directly, will mean instant dismissal.

Now, we must remember, in that connection, that the only check which the Government had at all upon the time of the men which was being kept in connection with this work up to that date, was the check by Mr. Desbarats himself. No sooner had Mr. Desbarats made himself objectionable to the political superintendent of the work, than within two days afterwards he received his dismissal from the department. On the 6th of February, two days following the attempt made to check the men employed, Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Parent a letter intimating that the subject of the pay-rolls had been under consideration; that the Minister has given no authority for Mr. Desbarats' salary to be increased from \$105 to \$150, and that he is to be dismissed. Parent writes back, protesting in the most vigorous language against Desbarats' dismissal, and