

Mr. J. D. REID. He might possibly, but I should think he would be better engaged in making shoes. What I claim is that there should be an engineer stationed on the work to see that the contract is properly carried out; and he should have an assistant under him capable of estimating the quantity of material in the scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The inspector is not to estimate the quantity in the scow. The contents of the scow are given him by the engineer, and it is his duty to see that no scow goes out unless it is filled.

Mr. J. D. REID. If that is the case, the hon. minister, if he was at the Public Accounts Committee, knows that hundreds of scows went out only half filled.

Mr. PARDEE. And the inspector swore that when they were only half filled he charged them as being only half filled.

Mr. J. D. REID. When a scow was only half filled, the inspector, who never had any experience in measuring scows, stated that he had simply to guess the quantity in the scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not that an exceptional case, in which, owing to low water, the scow could not go out fully loaded?

Mr. BENNETT. I challenge the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) to produce a return in which it was sworn that there was less than the full amount in the scow.

Mr. PARDEE. The inspector swore that half scows went out. The hon. member for East Simcoe asked how it was that full scow loads were charged. He said that the two halves were added together, and he made his return accordingly.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was a case, as the minister stated, in which a scow went out only partially loaded on account of the low water. But in every contract it is left solely and entirely to the inspector to estimate the quantity the government are paying for. I claim that if the Public Works Department are going to continue this dredging work by contract, they should have an engineer on each work every day. It is not in the interest of the public or in the interest of the Public Works Department or in the interest of the minister, to let a large dredging contract involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, and to leave it entirely to the kind of men the government have been appointing as inspectors to decide the amount the government has to pay under these contracts.

Mr. PARDEE. Would the hon. gentleman advocate the policy of having a civil engineer continuously on every dredging job?

Mr. J. D. REID. The amount the government is paying engineers in charge of these

Mr. D. ROSS.

works is, I think, not more than \$150 a month, and the inspectors receive something like \$3 a day. I would ask the hon. member for Lambton, if he had a work involving the expenditure of several hundreds of thousands of dollars, whether as a business man he would not pay the difference and have an experienced engineer qualified to measure the work and go into it thoroughly and know exactly the quantity in each scow?

Mr. PARDEE. All I can say in answer to my hon. friend's question is that throughout the whole investigation in the Public Accounts Committee this year into the dredging contracts, it has not been shown by any evidence that any inspector made any false return, or that the country was injured in the very least. If it was shown that the returns were honestly made, why add to the expense, when hon. gentlemen opposite are always complaining of the expenses of the government?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman making the statement that it has not been shown that the government have lost anything. He knows that one inspector inspected for two dredges.

Mr. PARDEE. It was not shown that anything was lost. It was shown that one inspector had been guilty of malfeasance in office by farming out his job, but the moment the government found that out he was dismissed. But it was not shown that the returns were untrue.

Mr. J. D. REID. How could we show anything else?

Mr. PARDEE. Why draw a conclusion if there is no evidence from which to draw it?

Mr. J. D. REID. We had the evidence of the government engineers that the scows varied to the extent of from ten to twenty yards.

Mr. PARDEE. And you have the further evidence that just what was in the scow was returned.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the point raised by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) at the beginning of the discussion on this question, which the minister has not yet elucidated; that is, the resemblance of the handwriting in two rival tenders for this dredging work at Midland and Waubauskene. The hon. member for East Simcoe asked me to have a look into the handwriting of these two tenders, and I have done so, and there is no doubt that the addresses on the two envelopes are in the same handwriting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman looked at the figures setting down the prices?

Mr. MONK. I will come to those in a moment. There is no doubt that both ten-