

for about \$51,000 in round numbers. He tendered too low, no doubt. The House was sitting when he gave up the work, and I have not been able to go fully into the matter. I will see what we can do when the House rises. This is one of the cases where the lowest tender should not have been accepted, and shows that the Minister should sometimes have more latitude than he has at present.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister must see that when he comes and asks for a vote he should state how much is required to do the work. I presume that the \$53,000 voted last year was the amount required to do the work. The Minister says it is so, because the contract was in the neighbourhood of \$51,000. I suppose the rest is for superintendence, and so forth?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. HAGGART. In other words, \$53,000. Now he comes down to \$33,000, of which he states he has expended in the neighbourhood of \$7,000, or perhaps a little more, including liabilities of \$10,000 or \$11,000, say \$43,000. The House has a right to expect an estimate as to how far this \$43,000 will go towards the completion of the work. The engineer must have given an estimate of the work. What was the amount he said would be necessary to complete the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to know the amount of the other tenders above the tender accepted of \$50,999. These were the amounts of the other tenders: \$66,840, \$68,500, \$69,831, \$70,845, \$73,794, \$77,249, \$88,491, \$88,890, \$90,000, \$98,540, \$99,450, \$99,499, \$105,900. So the hon. gentleman will see that the highest tender was just a little more than double the tender which was accepted.

Mr. HAGGART. First of all, you give us the amount required to do the work, then you have a statement of the amount required each year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will understand that it would not be in the public interest for me to give the estimate of my chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want anything that will be an information to intending contractors. But the hon. gentleman should ask for a general vote, and an amount to be expended this year. He should ask for a vote of \$80,000, of which \$33,000 is to be expended this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to giving personally to my hon. friend the information, but I could not give it publicly.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no need of that. Is he going to let this work by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

L'Orignal—Re-construction of wharf..... \$6,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has been going on last year, and is nearly completed. There is a great deal of trade there.

Port Burwell—Improvement of harbour, provided interested parties expend a sum of \$50,000..... \$25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the words "provided interested parties expend \$50,000" be struck out.

Mr. HAGGART. Explain how it was that interested parties were going to give \$50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I asked for that vote last year we expected that some parties from the United States interested in the coal trade, would share in the construction of the work, but they have notified me that they cannot do so. As Port Burwell is a very important harbour, I thought well to ask for this vote without any conditions. We have spent large sums of money on harbours which are much less important than Port Burwell.

Mr. HAGGART. I think this was a case where a coal company intended to make a terminus. They were building barges and large steamers on the other side of Lake Erie, and it was principally for their accommodation that this deepening was to be done. They were to have paid a large portion of the cost, and we were to supplement it by \$25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not hear that they were building boats. At any rate they notified me that they could not go on and fulfil their pledges. This \$25,000 will put me in a position to do the work. I want to inspect the place myself as soon as the session is over.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a considerable sum in view of a pledge by other parties to spend \$50,000. This seems to be entirely disproportionate to sums that have been expended elsewhere. Could the hon. gentleman say if these parties are benefiting in any sense by the expenditure of this \$25,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That money was not asked for in the interest of private parties. We want to help build that harbour so as to facilitate the coal trade.

Mr. CLANCY. In the case of Collingwood Harbour, I think that when a vote was asked for last year the citizens of Collingwood, or some other parties, were to contribute a certain sum. Now, this is a parallel case. A departure in one case would be unfair to the other, and a departure in both