

I will give them to him as they have been stated to me by those who are in a position to give information on the subject. I have had several letters from that section of the country, complaining of the manner in which this work has been carried out. The first complaint is that the contract should have been finished in September last and the second complaint is, as I have heard it, that no security was required for the completion of the contract; and third, that no preparations have been made to continue the contract. The harbour, last fall, I am told, was in a state of complete dilapidation. Since my attention was drawn to this condition of affairs, I placed on the Order Paper a notice calling for correspondence and documents, but it has become so late in the Session that it could not be reached, and of course it had to go like the others, last Friday. But the complaint is very strong, that no preparations have been made to continue the contract and that the work seems likely not to proceed any further. I may say that this conviction is strengthened by the circumstance that nothing has been done during the past winter with a view of going on with the work next summer. No timber, or stone, or material of any kind have been procured for the purpose of going on with the work in the spring. Of course, in that section of the country, as in most other parts of Canada, the winter is the proper time to prepare for the work of the summer. Now, it is very desirable that this work should be looked after and that this gentleman should be compelled to continue his contract, otherwise the harbour, if allowed to continue in its present condition, will be completely destroyed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was ready the other day to give the information if the hon. gentleman had had an opportunity of making his motion. I will answer the hon. gentleman now by saying that John Sinnott made a contract with the Department on the 10th of February, 1883, for the construction of a breakwater on the eastern side of St. Peter's Bay, for the sum of \$3,930, agreeing to complete the same on the 29th September the same year. Early in September he asked for an extension of time, stating it would be impossible to finish the work during 1883. He was informed that no extension would be granted, but that he must finish the work; and on the 6th of October he was informed by the Engineer in charge that he would be held responsible for the work in its unfinished state, and liable for all damages which might befall the work by its being left unfinished. The amount paid Mr. Sinnott for this work is \$1,500, and is paid in proportion to the work done. The hon. gentleman said that he understood there were no sureties given. He says he only heard so, and I must say he made a fair statement. There were not any sureties for the contract, because it is not the custom of the Department to require any, for the reason that we withhold the sum of 5 per cent., which, in this case, amounted to \$196.50, as security for the completion of the contract.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Do I understand from the Minister that the work will be proceeded with in the spring.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister in what manner the vote for Victoria Breakwater last year was expended. Was a contract let, or was the work done by day's work? Has the whole amount been spent? And can he tell me in what position that breakwater stands now? Is it his intention to let any contract for the completion of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Supplementary Estimates, I think, will contain the vote for that work. Wood Island is in the same position. The amount of money was too small, therefore we did not proceed with the work.

Mr. DAVIES. Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether that work was done by contract or by day's work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think by days' work. So far as I can recollect, \$2,000 was expended.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take any vote to complete the breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think a small vote will appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, of course, understands that a very large amount of money has already been expended, which will be absolutely useless unless the work is completed.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, NEW BRUNSWICK.

St. John Harbour—Breakwater at Negro Point—To complete	\$42,000 00
River Tobique and River St. John, above Grand Falls	3,000 00
River St. John—River des Chutes to Bear Island	2,000 00
Madawaska River	1,000 00
Anderson's Hollow—Addition to Pier	2,000 00
Mispec Breakwater	3,000 00
Hopewell Cape—Ballast Wharf, &c—To complete	4,000 00
Buctouche	1,000 00
For extended Railway wharf accommodation at Carleton, St. John, N.B.	10,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to the breakwater at Negro Point, it will be remembered that about one-third of the work was destroyed by gales in 1879. We expended, in 1882, \$55,000; in 1883, \$30,000; in 1884, \$31,000. We now ask for a revote of \$40,000, which is required to carry on the work during the next fiscal year. I understand the work is being restored, with good prospect of it being a permanent one, and much stronger than it was in the first instance, experience having taught us what is required to resist storms there. With respect to Mispec breakwater, \$3,000 is asked. This is for the construction of a breakwater 200 feet long by 25 feet wide. The probable cost will be \$10,000. The amount of \$4,000 is asked for a ballast wharf at Hopewell Cape. This vote is required to construct a further length of 200 feet by 20 feet. As regards the item for Buctouche, the \$1,000 is a revote to complete the work, the total cost of which will be \$4,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is this wharf accommodation—at Carleton, St. John, N.B.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been no expenditure there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why then ask a vote? It is on the wrong side of the harbour altogether. There is no railway there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly there is; it runs down to Carleton on the wharf.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not a Government road, and why build a wharf for it? What company is it?

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). This is the Carleton Branch, I presume; part belongs to the county and part to the city. It is an extension of the New Brunswick Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It does not belong to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All the railway wharves and harbour accommodation belong to the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Government does not own an inch of the harbour of St. John. I should think that this vote ought to be taken out now, and put in again four years hence, when it will be required afresh.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I expected that the Minister of Finance would be here to explain this vote, as I have not the information; therefore, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the vote to pass, and take the explanation on Concurrence.