

we are voted down in committee, and in the country if we are voted down in this House, to fight this vote as one of the most nefarious jobs ever perpetrated by this government.

Mr. INGRAM. When this vote was asked for last year it was granted under an explanation of policy made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland). That hon. gentleman said that his policy would be, in carrying out any new work, to carry it out by contract after publicly calling for tenders, and that he would lay before this House a proper estimate, made by the engineer of his department, of the cost of the work, so that hon. members on both sides might know what they were voting for. Now, if hon. gentlemen will read 'Hansard' of last year, they will see that the House was led to believe that the money then voted was to be spent upon an entirely new work. There is no question about that. But something has leaked out since to prove that the work was not a new work. Within a week after the money was granted last year there was a demand made by the North Shore Power and Navigation Company for \$34,000 for work done by that company. Now what I ask—and I ask it in all fairness because I do not wish to discuss this matter in a carping way—is, where is the correspondence that took place before this demand for \$34,000 was made? There must have been such correspondence and we as members of this House are entitled to see it. The fact that the government did not carry out the work by contract, and the fact that they did not let the House know that a part of the work had been done, is sufficient evidence to any reasonable man that there is something wrong. There was concealment. Whether that concealment can be justified or not, I do not know, but concealment itself indicates that there was something wrong. Now, what have we at this moment? We have an item for \$60,000 more, and we are asked to vote that \$60,000 directly in the face of the statement made by the hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland) and who, I understand, is still Minister of Public Works, and for whom my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) is acting at this moment.

That is the public impression, that is our impression, and we have never been notified to the contrary. That being the case, we are still under the old system as inaugurated by that hon. gentleman and we have a right to assume that this work should have been carried out by contract instead of in the way it has been carried out. Will the hon. gentleman who is administering the department now tell the House that Mr. Sutherland has nothing to do with the Public Works Department and that this is a new system he is going to carry out himself to have work of this character and of this

Mr. TAYLOR.

magnitude \$85,000 done by day labour or under the supervision of a company over whom we have no control? If that is the case the sooner we know it the better. For my part I have listened carefully to this discussion and I cannot make up my mind to support this item without some information that is being concealed at this moment. The minister has not told us that his engineer has inspected this work. I infer it was the engineer of this North Shore Navigation Company that did this work; it certainly was not an engineer of the department. That being true we were certainly misled last session because the work was partially done by a private company and you must take into consideration that you are inaugurating a peculiar system. I care not what limits are in question or who purchased these limits, but I ask are the people of Canada going to vote money to every company who choose to buy timber limits anywhere, who choose to start in to build a wharf for their own accommodation? Are we to accept the word of an engineer whom they have instructed to do that work? Are we to take the opinion of any engineer other than the engineer of the Public Works Department who is responsible to this House through the minister, for every report he may make? I must say to the hon. minister that we have a right to get more information than he has given to-night in connection with this. We have a right to get that portion of the information which is being withheld, whether intentionally or not I do not know. We have a right to see the correspondence that led to this demand for \$34,000. If hon. gentlemen in asking the \$25,000 had told the committee candidly and frankly: The reason we are asking this \$25,000 is that a certain company has started to build a wharf, that we believe they are doing right and we want the \$25,000 to help to recoup them for the money they have expended on this wharf and next year we may ask an additional sum—if that statement had been made on that occasion there would have been no reason for this discussion to-night. I for one, will not vote for the item of \$60,000, thus making a total expenditure of \$85,000, until the necessary information is brought down.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived, yeas 21, nays 35.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want the minister in all fairness to hold the item over until the plans are brought down. We have come to the conclusion that we have been too easy in taking the word of ministers in reference to such works as this and the similar work at Grande Vallée. If it can be shown that this harbour will be useful as a harbour of refuge I am satisfied that the opposition will not hesitate to vote this sum. Will the minister undertake to bring the plans over?