

bound, in the discharge of their duty, to give to every hon member of this House. The fact was proved by these documents which had been laid upon the table by the hon. the First Minister himself, that a contract had been given out, by the late Government, for \$78,000 which required the construction of a breakwater 700 feet in length, with a channel dredge 200 feet wide and 15 feet deep. A contract which bound the contractor to take all the risks of damage to that work, which might arise during its construction, and to pay for any extras which might be caused if it was not completed within the term mentioned. No sooner had the Government changed hands than that contract was broken. One of the Cabinet Ministers, a colleague of the hon. the First Minister transferred it from the contractor to whom it had been given to his own brother, and the result was what might be expected from a Government which would use its power to give to relatives of its members the charge of public works of this kind, the whole contract was made waste paper of. Instead of 700 feet they curtailed this work to 500 feet, and, as his hon. friend had remarked, any one who knew anything about the construction of public works, knew that that meant an immense disproportionate curtailment in the work, because every foot of this increase length cost double the trouble and work of that near the shore, so that this contract of \$78,000 was, probably, in point of work, one-half that which the contract required. According to the original contract, the contractor was obliged to improve the channel, to dredge 200 feet wide and 15 feet deep; and, upon the evidence of the Government, all that was done was a channel of 60 feet wide and 12 feet deep, and yet the fact remained that this gentleman, the brother of a Cabinet Minister, whose work had been curtailed one-half, not only received the full amount of \$78,000 of public money, but had a claim for a large amount of extras over and above that sum. Besides this startling charge, there was another charge brought against another member of the Government, and against the whole Gov-

ernment, with relation to this contractor: that this gentleman, who was known to be an outspoken friend of the Government, was suddenly transformed by the Minister of Militia, who had been called down to meet him at Truro previous to an election, into a Government candidate, and a telegram was sent him relieving him from his contract, to enable him to run as candidate.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman must know he was not relieved of his contract.

MR. TUPPER: He was relieved.

MR. MACKENZIE: He was not relieved.

MR. TUPPER: He ran as a Government candidate after communication with the hon. the Minister of Militia.

MR. MACKENZIE: Read the communication.

MR. TUPPER said he had not the communication, but if his recollection was not altogether at fault, the hon. gentleman had himself detailed the fact that he was communicated with by Mr. Ross in reference to being relieved of his contract in order to run his election, and he ran his election as Government candidate and was defeated by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Campbell). Then the Government which had previously relieved him of his contract, allowed him to resume it and remain the public contractor as before. He (Mr. Tupper) would undertake to say that had he obtained a majority, it would be found he was not a contractor. There was not a member of this House who could doubt that. The result of the whole affair was that this gentleman who became transferred into a contractor through the influence of his brother, a Cabinet Minister, and who ran as a Government candidate, after a communication with another Cabinet Minister, was paid the full contract amount \$78,000 for doing half the work and a large amount in addition under the head of extras. The hon. the First Minister had stated he still had a claim for \$16,000. The hon. the First Minister assumed to-day the position of being taken entirely by

MR. TUPPER.