

“ Unfortunately for them and for me, that contract is not yet finished, and from my experience in public contracts in Australia, extras would not be even asked till original contract was finished. The experience from Nova Scotia, as often detailed in the *Herald*, would not make me expect anything from the Dominion Government, except what I would be entitled to under the contract. Those who know me are already satisfied that this is all I expect to recover. No money except what I was honourably entitled to was ever received by me, and so far not one cent received or promised except what was certified by the engineer for work done. A large portion of the contract was carried away last fall, which was this year rebuilt, and completed to the satisfaction of the engineer in charge, and I did ask that the wood work being so finished would be taken off my hands, but this was refused till the whole contract would be finished. Such are the favours that I have received from the Dominion Government. Mr. Campbell and any men who choose may examine the public records and they will find no claims of this kind or any demand for extras made by me, I always understood that even extras had to be voted by Parliament before they could be promised or paid.”

How did the Minister of Public Works reconcile this statement with the one he had made to the House? Why were extras put down here and paid for to the extent of \$4,000 or \$5,000? It was ridiculous that the public money should be paid out in this manner. He thought that he had placed the case, as far as was in his power, sufficiently plainly before the House, and he would say no more on the subject.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. TUPPER said he was very much astonished to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, in reply to so gross a statement of the case as this, express their readiness to have the members called in and a vote taken to dispose of the question, without any explanation, and without any vindication being offered on the part of the Government. The hon. member for Inverness must have spoken, he thought, under a misapprehension of the facts, when he made the appeal to the House that he did, and thought it possible that members could deal with a matter of this kind without any opportunity being offered them to possess themselves of an accurate knowledge of the case. Why the hon. member could not have known that this case, which the hon.

the Minister of Public Works treated as a surprise, was a question which the hon. gentleman certainly ought not to have been in a position to treat as a surprise. The fact that this was a matter of frequent discussion during last Session, that there had been a very full and strong controversy in relation to it, that these papers had been moved for again and again by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Campbell), that they had been finally brought down by the hon. the First Minister himself, and laid upon the table of this House, precluded at once the possibility of the hon. gentleman urging that he was taken by surprise, or that he was not in a position to have all these facts and everything in relation to the case under his command. Why was it that every member of this House had not the same means of judging this case, the same full knowledge of it as the hon. the First Minister? Simply because the Government, having a majority on the Printing Committee, refused to have these papers printed and placed in the hands of hon. members. This case, instead of being an unimportant case, was a very important one, as detailed in the motion of his hon. friend, a motion which must carry conviction to the mind of every hon. member, provided the facts were accurately stated, and those facts were taken simply from papers laid by the Government on the table of this House, and which had been in their possession for about twelve months. If there was any case which could not be treated as a surprise, with which the Government should be thoroughly prepared to deal, it was this one. Why had the Printing Committee, upon which the Government had a majority, refused to give to hon. members the information to which they were entitled? Because the facts, as detailed in the motion of his hon. friends, were so strong; because they carried on their face evidence of improper conduct on the part of the Administration, in respect to expenditure of public money, that they dared not produce those documents. The Printing Committee deserved condemnation for not having produced, when required, documents containing charges of so grave a character against the Government, and which they were