

computation it was shown that the Martin tender was \$1,084 less than that of Bourgoin and Lamontagne.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE stated that in a tender let at Kingston, a political friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite tendered three dollars below a political friend of the Administration, and the lowest tenderer got the contract. It was precisely so in this case.

Mr. MASSON said he had no complaint to make in reference to the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary contract for wood, which had been given to friends of the Administration.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the contract was given out by a political friend of the late Administration.

Mr. MASSON said that gentleman had no doubt changed his political principles lately. When gentlemen from the Lower Provinces and the Province of Quebec and members of the Crown changed round, it would not be surprising that the Warden of a Penitentiary should allow his political opinions to change. It had been proved that the Warden of the Penitentiary had awarded the contract upon the urgent representations of the hon. gent's political friends. Mr. Masson here read extracts from the report of the Committee which inquired into the matter, and said that at one of the meetings of that Committee the hon. member for Chateauguay asked if it was not the custom of the late Government to give contracts to their political friends? To this inquiry the witness replied that they invariably gave the contract to the lowest tenderer. He next stated that under the late Administration the Government had always given the contracts for supplies for the Government institutions to the lowest tenderers, and he could prove by the record that in the majority of cases the contracts were given to Reformers.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said, as the hon. gentleman had referred to this matter, he thought he should have gone a little further and referred to the enquiry which was made respecting the purchase of a quarry at St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. MASSON—It is not in point.

Mr. DESJARDINS.

Mr. HOLTON said it was perfectly in point, and he called upon the hon. gentleman to read that report. With regard to the wood contract, the Warden stated emphatically that he regarded the party who had made the lowest tender as not qualified to fulfil the contract, but it had been awarded to one who had put in a higher tender, on his accepting it at the figure of the lowest tender. The public had suffered no wrong, and the Warden who had awarded the contract was, when in this House, a supporter of the former Administration, and had been appointed to his present position by the right hon. gentleman himself. As the hon. member for Terrebonne would not read the report in regard to the quarry purchased, he would do so himself. The sub-Committee examined Mr. F. X. Auclair, the proprietor of the farm on which the quarry was situated, and other witnesses. The report was as follows:—

“It appears from the evidence that the quarry in question was offered to the Government by its original proprietor late in November 1872, for the sum of \$9,000; that no answer to this offer was received; that early in the following month of December Mr. E. H. Lemay purchased the quarry from Auclair for the sum of \$9,000; that later in the same month of December, valuers were appointed by the Government or by the Directors of Penitentiaries, under instructions from the Minister of Justice, to report on the value of the quarry, which was variously estimated at \$29,750, and at \$25,750; that the quarry was offered by Lemay to the Government for \$18,000, at which price it appears to have been finally accepted by the Government in the month of January 1873, and a vote for the money was obtained at the next Session of Parliament; that Mr. C. A. Dansereau, chief editor and co-proprietor of *La Minerve*, a journal established in Montreal, took an active part in the negotiation of the Lemay, sale of the quarry to the Government by and in consideration of his supposed influence, or the influence of his firm and journal, he was to receive individually, according to Lemay's evidence—but for his firm according to his (Dansereau's) own evidence—one-sixth part of the profits arising from the transaction; that over and above one-sixth share of the profits so stipulated for, Dansereau demanded of Lemay the sum of \$2,000 for an election fund, which he (Dansereau) says Lemay had previously agreed to pay, and that this demand was made pending the election in the County of Laval, in October 1873, and the money was intended to be used in connection with these elections, but it does not appear that Lemay ever paid this sum of \$2,000 or any portion thereof. It seems to be established beyond dispute or doubt that double the sum was paid for the quarry that it was offered or might have been purchased for; that the sale by Lemay was