

has been there, and in view of the fact that there is no contradiction of his statements, it is proved that the government came down last year and asked and obtained \$25,000 to build a wharf, and at the same time, and six months before, the company were at work building a wharf. Now they come forward and ask another appropriation of \$65,000. From the papers laid on the table of the House it is proved that no tenders were advertised for, that there was simply a bargain with these people who are to go ahead and complete it. If last year, when the committee was asked to vote \$25,000 to commence this work, they had known all these circumstances, the opposition would have voted that this appropriation be struck out. I would, therefore, move that this item of \$65,000 be struck out.

Mr. BELL. In listening to the reading of the certificate by the engineer I thought it was a very cautious one. Were there any subsequent surveys obtained by the department before they paid the money?

Mr. HYMAN. The money was paid upon an account by the company upon the certificate of the two resident engineers and the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Who were the two engineers?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Tassé and Mr. Lamoureux.

Mr. HYMAN. Are they engineers of the department?

Mr. HYMAN. They are both engineers of the department. One is district engineer and the other is resident engineer.

Mr. BELL. And they certify both as to quantity and price?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the certificates of these engineers there?

Mr. HYMAN. They will be on the bill rendered by the company.

Mr. CLARKE. Have we that bill before us?

Mr. HYMAN. What is here is simply a statement of the expenditure.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no certificate of any engineer there.

Mr. HYMAN. That will be filed.

Mr. CLARKE. There must be some more papers filed, because certainly that file is incomplete.

Mr. HYMAN. The bill rendered by the company would not form part of the papers in the possession of the department in any case.

Mr. BELL. If this embankment was constructed, as it has been said, by the company simply dumping in the harbour the

Mr. TAYLOR.

stone from the excavations on the railway, and they were paid \$1.25 a yard for that, the company must have reason to look on this as a fairly paternal government. That is a very fair rate of pay. We have not very full information in reference to this matter, and if the minister can assure us that he can give some further information, I think he should let the item stand until Monday.

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me that there is really no further information that can be laid before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely there is some more correspondence that can be brought down. There must be the first application for a grant, and then an attempt should be made to reconcile the statement of the minister last year when he asked for the \$25,000. I have produced here a statement that there is not a man within nine miles of this place. Surely, in the face of this statement, the government are not going to force it through.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the mouth of what river is this pier being erected?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me it is at Pointe Noir.

Mr. CLARKE. This committee are entitled to know if the government are in possession of any information or report from the engineer. We passed a vote of \$25,000 last year to commence the construction of a pier for a specific purpose. The hon. gentleman's predecessor gave us particulars last year when he asked this vote of \$25,000. It is not creditable to the department that we have to drag these statements out in order to get information to enable us to know what we are doing. The minister made specific statements as to the location of the dock, the length of the pier, depth of water, &c. He must have done that from some advice or report of his engineers. We are entitled to know why the engineer abandoned the location, why he accepted this new property, and if it will suit. He has made no statement to that effect in the documents which have been submitted to us.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer that the work which this vote is asked to complete will fulfil all the requirements that it was intended to fulfil when the vote of \$25,000 was asked for.

Mr. CLARKE. I can only say that in so far as I am personally concerned that statement by the engineer will mitigate the conditions considerably, but we have a right to have some report from the engineer to justify this departure from the policy announced by the hon. Minister of Public Works last year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I find that by the letter read that this wharf is not near the west side of the harbour of Seven Islands at all. It is said to be at the mouth of the St. Margaret river according to the letter