

the facts contained in the recital of this resolution were correct. How was he to know? Was he to take the *ipse dixit* of the hon. gentleman as a fact? The *onus probandi* lay on the hon. gentleman, and it was quite unnecessary for the Government to say anything in defence until the hon. gentleman made out, at least, a *prima facie* case against them.

MR. CAMPBELL said this resolution had brought up a more serious charge than he had anticipated. The papers in connection with the Ingonish Harbour were last year sent to the Printing Committee, and they refused to print them. If they had printed them he would not have said a word, as the papers would have explained themselves. There was no certificate of the Engineer among the papers, although it was ordered to be produced two or three times. He (Mr. Campbell) exonerated the Engineer from blame, because he had not certified to any such payments. This was a serious question, that \$40,000 or \$50,000 of the public money should have been paid away corruptly. If the Government were guilty, as he was prepared to say they were, the House should consider the matter fairly and dispassionately. It appeared that in 1873 the Government of the day advertised for tenders to build the harbour of Ingonish. Four tenders were sent in: one by Mr. Evans, one by Mr. McKenrie, one by Mr. Ross, and one by Mr. Devlin. It appeared that, after these tenders were in, Mr. Ross, who was then a member of this House, had communication with the Minister of Public Works at that day, and begged him to postpone any action on the tenders. That was granted; and the result of that interview appeared to be that the lowest tenderer did not get the contract; but McKenrie, who was next, and in partnership with the two Rosses, got the contract. It appeared that Mr. Ross was entrusted with the task of getting the contract executed, and he was witness to the contract himself. He changed the sureties with the consent of the Government of the day, and got two farmers without means to become sureties in a matter involving an

MR. MACDONNELL.

expenditure of from \$70,000 to \$80,000. The work was proceeded with, and a few months afterwards the Government changed hands, and Mr. William Ross became a member of the Government. It was then managed that McKenrie should withdraw from the contract, and that it should be handed to John Ross and Mr. McKay. The contract went on. There appeared to have been a long correspondence between Mr. Ross and the Premier about altering the plan of the work; and it appeared that Mr. Ross commenced building the pier at his own expense, and without the sanction of the engineer. But after a little correspondence the Minister of Public Works consented that the diagonal piece should be put on. In January, 1876, the contractors requested the Minister of Public Works to allow them to reduce the length of the pier to 600 feet instead of 700 feet, and to build the last block with a sharp angle instead of a square angle as was shown in the plans. It appeared that in June 1876, eighteen months after the time the contract was to be finished, the Government consented to this, and also that the engineer in May, 1876, reported that the contractors could not finish the contract. They failed owing to the want of means and material. It was not the engineer who suggested reducing the work, the Minister of Public Works sent him the contractors, letter to ask his opinion, and that opinion was, that they had wholly failed and could not complete the work according to the tender. But the engineer never suggested that the contractors should be paid for what they had not built. Further, he had applied for the certificate of the engineer to which the Minister of Public Works had referred three or four times and there was not the scrape of a pen of the engineer to show that this large amount was to be paid. These certificates were not in existence or they would have been forthcoming. It further appeared that this pier was only 565 feet long, including this three angled block leaving 200 feet short of what the contract required. The contract set forth that if the work was reduced there should be a reduction of prices in proportion