

was \$329,000. These parties were paid in full, and they had no other claim. The contract has not been extended from that day to the present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a new contract in 1897 to continue the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To clean it out and at a rate per day, which was paid before for the dredge, but the extra width was not contracted for in 1897.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Haggart) judgment ought to be better than mine.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But we ought to have accurate information about it. Let the Minister of Finance consider the facts for a moment. The contract price, with the quantities moneyed out, was \$312,000. This contract was let in 1878. There was paid in 1896 on that contract \$629,000. That included the judgment of the Exchequer Court and the amount that had been previously paid to Mr. Gilbert. The Minister of Railways and Canals continued the employment of these parties, and his justification was that he employed them at the same rate that I paid them. I had paid them \$425 a day for the use of their dredge while Mr. Kennedy was making an examination of the channel; and the hon. minister continued the contract with them for the amount that I was obliged to pay for the use of the dredge for the examination of the channel. The expenditure was to cease in 1896, for the hon. member for Grenville showed the uselessness of the work, and, besides that, there was a lock built in the canal for the purpose of overcoming the difficulty and rendering any further expenditure needless. The Galops channel is not used by the big boats coming down to-day. It is used by the boats—just as it was before—in going up, if what I am told is correct. Every boat coming down goes down the canal to the new lock and out into the river below the rapids. The work, as originally contracted for by Mr. Mackenzie, which amounted to \$312,000, was increased, if the deputy minister is correct, by 100 feet more. But that would add only one-third to the quantities, making a total of about \$416,000. And what is the result of it all? The expenditure of nearly one million dollars. We have already paid \$800,000, the hon. minister asks here for \$25,000, and in the other estimates is an item of \$75,000. And still we have no promise from the minister that this is the end of the work—an expenditure of a million dollars on a work which was contemplated originally to cost \$416,000, and the expenditure still going on. And, as has been shown, the expenditure is entirely useless. More than that, we had the promise of the minister that there would be no more expenditure on that contract. The minister asked us for a

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

vote of \$50,000 last year, and for what? Not, as he said, for a work which had been authorized and done, but for the purpose of paying a percentage or drawback due to the contractors, and also a small sum of \$15,000 to remove such rocks as had fallen into the prism of the canal. Here is what the minister said on May 1st, 1902:

But simply for the purpose of removing the rock which has already been disturbed and is lying loose on the surface, and is, I am told, an obstruction to navigation. I cannot say that I see any particular advantage myself in having the work continued, since the canal will afford all the navigation that is necessary.

Then the minister, justifying the expenditure of even this small amount, said:

The appropriation, I am advised by the chief engineer, is necessary—not for the purpose of continuing the work, I do not propose to ask parliament for any money beyond this, a part of which is needed to pay the drawback. There is the amount of the drawback which we have to pay out of that \$50,000. . . . There is nothing in the estimates inserted with any intention to continue this expenditure or to continue this work.

I asked if any report had been received by the department or any estimates prepared for this work. I had the assurance of the minister that no account had come into the department for any work being done upon that canal or any certificate from the engineer. He gave the promise that the work would not be continued. But in spite of that, we have now a further expenditure of \$25,000 asked for, and also \$75,000 in the other estimates to continue the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The minister's statement last year with respect to continuing that work would not necessarily be at variance with this item, though it might be at variance with the item in the main estimates. The sum now under discussion is entirely for past payments. With regard to the statement that no work is being done and no certificate given, of course, that would be a grave matter. All I can say is that the engineer has reported that these people have done work to that amount, and has certified accordingly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I say is that I give the statement of the Minister of Railways last year, made on the authority of the chief engineer, that he had no demand for any claims on the work last year. The statement was made in this House that there was no work of that kind. This item, I understand, is for payment of work done last year, but, as I understand the minister, there is another item to come down for \$75,000 for the continuance of the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is already down.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the item now under discussion for work done last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For work done the year before last. It was the