

storm. The evidence of the engineer went to show that it was destroyed because it had a square end.

He contradicted this statement flatly. The engineer said quite the reverse: that it was not because it was a square end, but because it was not built properly and not according to his instructions, and the directions contained in the plans and specification. This pier was built without the consent of the engineer, and application was then made to the Government to have this stuck on the pier. The evidence of the engineer was that the pier was not destroyed because it had a square end. The hon. gentleman further stated:

“The engineer recommended that the pier for the last 150 feet should present an acute angle.”

The engineer did no such thing, but explained in these papers that they built this pier without his consent and knowledge, and that as it was built, it might as well be put there. The hon. gentleman also said:—

“This was partially done, when the work was destroyed by a second storm. These were accidents beyond, he presumed, the control of human power.”

This was the way in which the hon. gentleman treated this subject. They should have known these things before they commenced the work, and the contractors also. Besides, if works were destroyed by any means before they were taken off the contractors hands, the contractor was responsible for it, and not the people of this country. The hon. gentleman also stated that he had not the details of the Engineer with him, and he spoke entirely from memory. But the hon. gentleman should not speak from memory. This matter had been before the House all winter. He had repeatedly kept the hon. gentleman in mind of it, because he was continually asking for these papers; and it was not for a man in the hon. gentleman's position to get up and say that he was not prepared to give an answer to a question of this importance and that he was only speaking from memory. This was not satisfactory, when he had charged the hon.

MR. CAMPBELL.

gentleman with paying away public money improperly and under suspicious circumstances, when he had no right to pay it away. The hon. gentleman continued:—

“Not expecting this item would be discussed to-night.”

At this moment he could not find out what had become of this money or who had got it.

“However, the calculations of the Engineer were based upon what he conceived to be the proper interpretation of the contract and of the work performed. The contractors, as could be seen by papers laid before the House, had presented claims amounting to \$13,000. He had no means of knowing what the Engineer would report, as that gentleman had taken the papers in the case with him, but he would report as soon as possible. As to the dredging, his (Mr. Mackenzie's) opinion was that the contractors had no claim upon the Government.”

He held that this dredging was not half done. He could show from the papers that 140 feet of the contract was not dredged to three feet in depth.

“In the meantime, the Engineer had sent the Government his certificate for the amount now asked for.”

Where were these certificates. Why did not the hon. the Premier produce them? He wished to obtain these certificates. He felt confident that the engineer would not make out such certificates improperly; if so, he should not be employed by the Government another moment. But it did not appear that the engineer had sent in these certificates, or else the Government would produce them. If the Government could do so, they should show these papers. This matter had been before the country for a very long time, and how much had been paid? Was the money of the country to be given out in this manner? Was there no check at all on this expenditure? Were the public funds entirely at the mercy and in the power of the Premier? He would read the following extract from a letter written by Mr. John Ross on the 27th of September, after the election took place, in 1876, he believed:—