

and worked no more. He is charged in the defendant's account as having worked 38 nights at \$4.60 per night; that is to say, he is charged as having been paid for overtime whilst he was in the hospital disabled.

Zepherin Leveille worked 16 days, and is charged in the defendant's accounts as having worked 45 days, and so forth for the others, who all say that they have worked and were paid for a much shorter time than that charged by the defendant.

According to the accounts filed by Mr. St. Louis, the cost of cutting the stone for said Wellington bridge, Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1 averages \$30 per cubic yard, and we have the testimony of Mr. J. B. de Lorimier, contractor, to the effect that the same work would cost about \$4 and a fraction per cubic yard, if made in ordinary circumstances, but that it would cost more, of course, if made by night work or Sunday work.

Mr. McLeod says it should cost an average of about \$7 per cubic yard.

And here is where the department's malfeasance comes in:

In the tenders of Mr. St. Louis, above referred to, no mention is made of timekeepers, although, according to the evidence, they were just as necessary as the foremen, if not more so, for the proper execution of that large enterprise.

As there was no provision for timekeepers, according to Mr. St. Louis' contract, those assistant timekeepers were entered in Mr. St. Louis' accounts as night and overtime foremen, day masons, overtime skilled labourers. On that ground the defendant is charged with having obtained \$1,861.40 by false pretenses.

There was no proper surveillance by the officers of the Government, on two of the jobs at least; namely, the Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1 of the Lachine Canal. The timekeeping on the two latter jobs seems to have been left to take care of itself, as far as the Government officers were concerned.

Mr. St. Louis procured all the workmen that were asked of him. He did not keep their time personally. He had several clerks to do it. Those clerks made the lists, and one of them stuffed the lists. There can be no doubt as to that, because it is sworn to by himself, to his own disgrace, and when those lists were so made and cooked, they were certified blindly, and as a mere matter of form, by the officers of the Government. On the strength of those lists, so certified, the money was obtained from the Government. Every man's pay was put in a separate envelope, with his name on it, and distributed to the men, fictitious or real. One can conceive how easy it may have been to distribute loaded envelopes to fictitious men, or rather to men personating men, when it is known that sometimes as many as 800 men were there together shoving and jostling for their wages; so much so that the paying clerks had to require the services on some occasions of as many as 20 policemen to prevent the shanty where they were sheltered, from being overturned.

Who can wonder at it when men who never worked a day, were paid for 30, 40 and 50 days work? He winds up:

As stated above, I believe, after studying this record, that there have been frauds committed to the detriment of the Federal Government, but I do not think that they were as large as alleged. Mr. St. Louis' contract was extremely favourable

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

to him. He was allowed \$4 a day for a foreman stonemason, day time, and \$6 a day for the same foreman for night or overtime; \$8 for the same foreman on Sundays, and at the rate of \$12 for the same foreman for Sunday overtime. He was allowed \$5 a day for a double team, and \$10 a day for the same double team on Sundays. He was allowed \$2.50 a day for the use of a derrick, day time, \$3.75 for the use of the same derrick night or overtime, and at the rate of \$7.50 a day for the same derrick for Sunday overtime, and so forth on the same scale for stonemasons, stonemasons and skilled labourers.

It is no wonder that Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered that the job lasted about four months, and that there were at times as many as two thousand men at work in the day time, and 1,500 men at work at night time. The men were paid alternately every week. Mr. Michaud tells us that some of the pays amounted to \$34,000, some \$10,000, some \$15,000 and some to \$20,000. In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are:

1st. The exorbitant prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract; and

2nd. The almost unlimited number of men allowed on the said works, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

Now, Sir, I have at some length given those facts because they stand out in broad, black and damning disgrace of the department under which they were carried on. I say if these things can be done within a hundred miles of Ottawa, what must be done in contracts carried out 1,000 miles away. If such things can be done in the green tree what, I ask, may be done in the dry? Hon. gentlemen know that in this matter the Government have been guilty of criminal neglect. They know that in this matter there has been no business application, no business conduct. As in all other matters, everything seems to drift. There is a want of business knowledge, a want of business application. The country seems drifting slowly to the dogs. They let men get what prices they like, exorbitant prices, prices three, four, and five times more than they would pay if they were carrying out a private contract of their own. The public can judge why the Government pay these awful and exorbitant prices to men who, it was shown, give large contributions to their election funds. And we have to-day these gentlemen, not, mind you claiming exemption from the scandals of a year or two ago, but revelling in the scandals of the present. There is a want of business capacity which marks their dealings, not only in the Customs Department, but in Public Works, in the Railway Department, and throughout the whole Government. The heads of the Government seem to be gone. The men who guided them and to whom they looked up for inspiration and advice, have gone away, and we have the dregs left. The hon. gentleman moved a want of confidence, I almost wonder he took the trouble. Let them die, die as they are dying, through sheer inanition.