

works at Marion Bridge or Albert Bridge. There was also an appropriation of \$17,000 voted for a wharf at Mainadieu. In fact every item voted for that constituency has been dropped except a paltry \$3,000 for completing construction work at Cow Bay and \$5,000 for buying a sand bar at Sydney Harbour. The first vote that came down for Sydney Harbour was \$25,000 but now that vote is reduced to \$5,000. These are only small works and it was partially through the efforts of the former representative of that county that these items were put in the estimates and a part of them voted. It was really a hardship on these people that all these moneys should not be spent. Why they should have been dropped is something I cannot understand, and I am drawing to the attention of the hon. minister the necessity of going on with these works, and I trust that he will take the matter up. If these works could be attended at once especially those two little works on the Mira river, the hon. minister would be conferring a great benefit on that locality.

Mr. MONK. I shall certainly give my hon. friend's remarks every consideration. In the case of Main-a-dieu, I brought an estimate down but the government did not accept it, as it threw out many estimates I endeavoured to have accepted. With regard to Gabarous harbour, I find a note in the report to the effect that on August the 7th instructions were given to proceed with the expenditure of the amount authorized, and to consult Dr. Arthur Kendall about the appointment of a foreman. Dr. Kendall was written to on August 8, but he did not reply, and consequently no further action was taken. I shall, however, make a note of my hon. friend's request.

Mr. CARROLL. With reference to Gabarous harbour my answer is exactly what was given by my hon. friend from Antigonish. Dr. Kendall did consult me at the time, but only a part of the amount appropriated had been voted, and as there was an election on, we did not think it a proper time to go on with the expenditure on public works, because that would look like vote catching. Dr. Arthur Kendall is not responsible for the foreman not having been appointed, but myself. We were both consulted, but we thought there was no use appointing a foreman then as the House would meet in a few months, and we thought it was of no avail to appoint a foreman at that time in order to expend five-twelfths of the estimate when the estimate itself was so small.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). A condition of affairs prevails, to some slight extent at least, in Nova Scotia, and possibly in other provinces, by reason of the fact that a few years ago or more, votes were passed by

parliament and tenders asked for, and in some cases the lowest tender accepted, and the works have not been gone on with or the deposits refunded. The result is that in many cases the department now holds the moneys deposited by successful tenderers, and probably will hold them for a year or more, or possibly may not proceed with the work. I would like to suggest that in such cases the deposits of the lowest tenderers, which are still with the department, should be returned to the successful tenderer upon the understanding that should the department later on decide to proceed with the works, these tenderers would be asked to refund their deposits. That would be only fair, or else the department should allow interest on these deposits.

Mr. MONK. That would be fair enough, but we might decide to call for new tenders and not have accepted the first tender.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am referring to cases where the lowest tender was accepted. I know of three cases in Nova Scotia in which, before the present government came into power contracts were awarded in each case to the lowest tenderer, but the moneys for these works were not voted until 1912-13; and prominent friends of the government have approached the successful tenderers offering them a sum of money to assign to them their contracts. This is a very objectionable practice and places these persons in a very uncomfortable position. It makes them feel that influences are at work which will actually prevent them making contracts with the government; and if they had an understanding with such persons in the meantime, it would be an obstacle.

Mr. MONK. I would be obliged to my hon. friend if he would give me the facts of these cases. I know nothing of them.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I think the constituency which I have the honour to represent occupies a unique position in this regard, that whereas in the supplementary estimates brought down last year there were 14 or 15 works in that county provided for, in the present estimates there is just one item for a work in Inverness county. Will the minister be good enough to tell me what is being done in regard to that very important work, the Port Hood breakwater and harbour extension?

Mr. MONK. That is a work that has been going on for some time. It is under consideration. It is an important work, and we will endeavour to follow it up. But my hon. friend must not be too disappointed if a great many of these estimates have been struck out by the government. In the province of Ontario, notably on the Great Lakes, the estimates of the previous government have been cut in two.