

Mr. COPP. I am here.

Mr. FOWLER. The member for Digby might give us an explanation as to that contract which was in writing between himself and the municipality of the town of Digby, whereby he was to render his eminent services to procure from the government a very large grant for Digby and in return he was to receive \$5,000. I believe he got the \$500 on account. Is that \$10,000 part of the grant he was to get from the government? I would like to know whether he received any more of the amount?

Mr. COPP. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the \$10,000 voted last year has not been expended as yet. I am in hopes that it will be expended and that we will some day have a new pier at Digby. I can further assure the hon. gentleman that it has nothing to do with any contract I may have had with the town council in reference to any pay I may have received from them. I have never received any pay out of any moneys voted by the Dominion government with respect to the Digby pier or in any other way. This \$2,000 now voted is simply an annual grant that has been going on for years. Some years when it is found necessary it is expended and some years it is not. I think last year only about \$300 was spent, but this vote is put in every year and stands there so that if anything happens they will have it to fall back on and if nothing happens it is not expended. I never need ask for it.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not say that the hon. gentleman received any portion of the government grant. I want to know whether the \$10,000 voted last year was a carrying out of the contract made between him and the town.

Mr. COPP. I know nothing about it.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman knows nothing about it? Does he mean he does not know anything about such a contract being in existence, because we had the papers here a year ago, and there was \$500 voted by the town for the hon. gentleman, as I understand.

Mr. BENNETT. \$5,000, was it not?

Mr. FOWLER. The agreement was for \$5,000, but he received \$500 on account.

Mr. COPP. I assume the reference is to a matter which was brought up by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) some few years ago. I was only too anxious that the hon. gentleman should have gone on and had an investigation. However, he did not see proper to take that course. There is nothing in the transaction between the council and myself of which I am ashamed. I had no agreement with the council, but what took place between us

had nothing to do with the moneys voted by the government then or now, or in the future. The \$10,000, I believe, was put in by the Minister of Public Works himself. I had nothing to do with it; I did not ask him for it; and, in fact, I might say that I was urging something in another direction. But the pier is an interprovincial pier, and one which the members for St. John are as much interested in as I am. We want a new pier; we must have one. Whether it shall be provided for by the government or by the steamship owners is a question that has not been decided on as yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. gentleman say that there was not a contract entered into between himself and the municipality, whereby he was to receive a certain sum of money from the municipality, provided he got a grant from the government? If he says so, that ends it.

Mr. COPP. The hon. gentleman does say so. The agreement had nothing to do with the government whatever; the agreement between the council and myself had nothing to do with the Dominion government or the municipality of Digby. It was an agreement between the town council—

Mr. FOWLER. For what purpose?

Mr. COPP. To induce a company to undertake harbour improvements at Digby.

Mr. FOWLER. Will he say that the agreement in terms specified a company?

Mr. COPP. I almost forget what the agreement did specify, but that was the intention.

Mr. FISHER. The Digby pier was constructed many years ago, largely for the trade between Digby and St. John and also United States ports, and it has been getting into bad repair. We have had to expend public money on it from time to time. I am informed it is in even worse repair than usual, and the probability is that some very considerable works will have to be undertaken there, whether by the government, the steamship companies or the town of Digby, is a matter for future decision. The expenditure here indicated is a revote of part of the \$12,000 voted last year, some of which has been expended.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not want the minister to think I am condemning the vote; I think it is very necessary. I know the wharf there; it is a very long pier, rendered necessary by the depth of water there, and Digby is an important point, and no doubt the expenditure is necessary. I was simply trying to ascertain whether it had anything to do with the contract we heard of some time ago.