

told them he was prepared to do it again, and they applauded him to the echo. It is not the hon. Postmaster General I condemn; he is the victim of circumstances. He did it for his party and they applauded him and voted to declare his action perfectly correct. Then you had the Harris land job which stinks in the nostrils of the better disposed people of St. John. Then you have the Tay canal, the Sheik's Island dam, and the Galops Rapids. You had the culminating scandal when within a hundred miles of the capital city you had \$200,000 stolen on a \$200,000 contract. What about the Curran bridge scandal? Did hon. gentlemen read the remarks made by the judge who presided at the preliminary investigation? An hon. member behind me read a portion to the House the other day, but the House was thin? Will he allow me to read some of these remarks.

An hon. MEMBER. Fire away.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) "Fire away" says the hon. gentleman. Of course we can "fire away," but the question to which the country will demand an answer is, when the judge in his place has declared that \$200,000 has been stolen from the country, who are the culprits and how have they been punished? And if the Government say: No: the departments are so mixed up in this scandal we dare not punish, the tax-payers will repudiate the reason. On every hustings in Canada these facts will be spoken and the tax-payers will require an answer. The Government prosecuted one of the men the other day, for what? For obtaining \$170,000 under false pretenses. The judge dismissed the charge. I do not myself agree with the legal conclusion the judge drew. But I am not concerned with that. I am concerned with the facts which he stated and upon which there could be no difference of opinion. And what did the learned judge say? After reciting the charge he says:

Defendant sent in his accounts periodically, as the work was in progress, for the labour so furnished by him, and his accounts were certified by the officers of the Government, and the signatures of the latter to that effect affixed to the documents. The different accounts sent in by the defendant to the Government for labour furnished aggregate \$275,655.34. On the strength of these accounts the Government paid him \$220,550.20, and now complains that he has made overcharges in his accounts.

The two experts took cognizance of the contract for labour above mentioned obtained by the defendant, and the pay-lists and accounts rendered by the latter to the Government (and filed in this case). They also had communication of the depositions of

a number of the witnesses—

Acting upon the said information, the two experts made their respective reports separately. One of them, Mr. Vanier, certifies that the defendant has already been overpaid \$95,000 besides what he still claims, and the other, Professor

McLeod, says he has been overpaid \$100,000, also independent of what he still claims.

The prosecution has produced about forty carters who had been employed on said works. They all claim to have been employed for a shorter period of time and to have been paid smaller amounts than those charged by the defendant.

The prosecution, in support of their pretensions that the defendant has made overcharges for carters, have produced witness Henri Frigon, a brother-in-law of the defendant, who swears that he was employed from the 6th of March to the 21st of April, hiring men and checking the time of the carters who worked at the excavations for the Grand Trunk bridge. He says he kept two little books to that effect, which were given to him by Mr. Villeneuve, another brother-in-law of the defendant. It appears by these two little books, compared with defendant's pay-list, that the defendant overcharged the Government upwards of fifty thousand hours for carters during the said lapse of time (about 47 days).

He also admits that he entered in his said books as carters about twenty-five fictitious names of persons, who, of course, never worked at all. He says he entered such fictitious names at the request of Villeneuve, who wanted to raise a sum of money to buy himself a horse and rig, and for other outside expenses.

Frigon further says that defendant was aware of such fictitious names being put in. Frigon also admits that while being paid \$4.50 per day to keep the carters' time, as aforesaid, he managed to obtain from Mr. Kennedy another similar pay of \$4.50 per day, for services supposed to be rendered on the Wellington bridge, and he says he was to look after the tools and materials used for the construction of the Grand Trunk bridge, thus making for himself the snug pay of \$9 per day from the 7th of March to the 21st of April.

Frigon also asserts that he received from Villeneuve, besides his \$9 a day, about \$300 per month, money raised by fictitious names on the lists, and says he used this money towards a payment of expenses, wine, cab-hire, kitchen expenses, &c., for the benefit of St. Louis' job.

Now, with regard to the overcharges alleged to have been made by the stonecutters, Mr. Leonard Shannon, accountant, proves that the amount charged to the Government by the defendant for stonecutters on the three different works, namely, Wellington bridge, Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1, is \$42,535.25, exclusive of the time for foremen stonecutters. Expert witness, Mr. McLeod, gives his estimate for the cost of stone-cutting, and fixes it at \$10,953.98, making a difference or overcharge by defendant of \$31,581.29. Michael Doheny says that he counted the stonecutters for the three different works every day from the 20th March until the 17th May, a period of 58 days, and entered them in a book, which he filed. His figures, compared with the pay-list of the defendant, shows an overcharge by the latter of 3,307 days, equal to upwards of \$10,000 during the said period of time.

Charles Latour, mason, says he worked four days in all. C. Latour, who appears to be the same person, is charged in the defendant's accounts for 49 days, plus 30 hours' overtime.

Alme Rateau worked for about six or seven days, including night time, had an accident then