

MR. LANGEVIN said it was to be regretted this work had not been proceeded with. When the question of constructing Carillon Canal came up in 1873, a meeting was held of all the interests concerned, not only of Ottawa but of the Upper Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec. It was, after grave deliberation, decided that this work should be completed. Plans were drawn and the contract was awarded to the present contractors. No reason had been given why, after five years had passed, this work was not completed. He had been told there was a difference of opinion between the Department and the contractors about a certain portion of it under water, which the contracts claimed should be considered as extra work. If there was any doubt about this difficulty it could be submitted to arbitrators, and if decided in favour of the contractors, the Government should ask for a vote for the money required.

Vote agreed to.

90. Grenville Canal..... \$250,000

MR. MITCHELL asked who was the contractor for this work.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. James Goodwin. A change was made in 1871 and again in 1873. In 1873 the matter was referred to Mr. Page, and he made a report, upon which Mr. Goodwin executed the work done.

MR. MITCHELL said that the present Secretary of State, in order to carry the elections of 1874, and in the absence of the Premier, had promised Mr. Goodwin a very large increase in the rock work, which had enabled Mr. Goodwin to make a fortune out of the contract instead of losing one.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is not true.

MR. MITCHELL said he was referring to rumours and reports, some of which he believed to be true. He did not know whether there was a particle of truth in that statement.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is not a particle.

MR. MITCHELL said he believed Mr. Goodwin changed his politics about that time, and he believed the increase was part of his condition in doing so.

MR. MACKENZIE: I repudiate the insinuation of the hon. gentleman as one of the grossest falsehoods ever invented. Whoever invented it, I care not who he is, is a base scoundrel at heart.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): And whoever repeats it.

MR. MITCHELL said he believed there was some foundation for the rumour. He had not imputed it to the hon. gentleman, because the story, as he had heard it, was that the transaction either took place through the Secretary of State or another member of the Cabinet, whom he had heard named in connection with it.

MR. LANGEVIN said he was afraid the Minister of Public Works had not seen the papers, or, probably, he had forgotten them. Mr. Goodwin had laid his claims before the Government, and when the works were proceeding in 1873, the Chief Engineer made a report in reference to them. This additional work had been given to Mr. Goodwin, because he could do it cheaper than anyone else, having the plans already on the ground. This was on the 1st October, 1873. He had recommended Mr. Goodwin's case, which was laid before the Government, but he found some difficulty in coming to a decision about it. The matter was referred to Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer, for information to learn as to how much Mr. Goodwin was entitled, but this did not at all bind the action of the Government. This was done on the 30th October, 1873, and the Order-in-Council was dated the day following, so any action taken on Mr. Page's report, the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible.

MR. MACKENZIE: I stated that.

MR. MITCHELL: You did not.

MR. MACKENZIE said that he had stated precisely what the hon. gentleman had detailed.

MR. MITCHELL: Not at all.

MR. MACKENZIE said that he gave an extract from the minute of Council dated Oct. 31, 1873; that the matter was referred to Mr. Page, to say what Mr. Goodwin should have; that many months afterwards—he could