the official arbitrators, and I believe it would be impossible to find any board or any officers who will scrutinize more closely and resist more determinedly any extravagance in payments. I think that these gentlemen do their duty, and discharge their duty very efficiently in scrutinizing with the utmost care all payments of public money. I have taken a good deal of pains to examine the testimony upon which they find their awards, and I do not think that they err on the side of being over-liberal towards claimants.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

258. To pay Mr. B. Walsh, of Halifax, for damages to his property..... $525.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This claim arises out of the construction of a double track, provided in the Estimates of last year, and a deep cutting made for the line separating one portion of his land from the other; and the amount is arrived at by the valuation of the officers, who considered that it was reasonable and wise to settle on that basis.

Mr. BLAKE. There seems to be a difference of opinion between the hon. gentleman's view and the opinion of the newspapers, regarding the official arbitrators. I saw the other day that the Government offered $100 for property for which $19,000 were claimed, and the arbitrators awarded the sum of $72; so certainly they are just towards the public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that this confirms my statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I say so. I give it as a remarkable instance.

259. Railways—General..... $25,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This arises in this way: The House will remember that an appropriation was made for a bridge at Emerson at the last Session of Parliament—an ordinary passenger bridge; and the Government agreed, in case that it was made into a railway as well as a passenger bridge, to ask Parliament for an appropriation of $20,000 additional. There was a great deal of anxiety in that section of country to obtain an extension from the Canadian Pacific Railway Junction, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to construct this branch of some twenty-two miles, provided that the towns of Emerson and West Lynne would build a bridge. These towns agreed to provide additional expenditure to construct a bridge, if we would raise our grant from a common highway to a railway bridge—from $20,000 to $50,000; and these $20,000 are to supplement our former grant.

Mr. BLAKE. What is it expected that the whole cost of the bridge will be?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not be certain, but I think about $150,000.

Mr. BLAKE. So much?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a large amount, I know.

Mr. BLAKE. What will this bit of railway, twenty-two miles, cost apart from the bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is a very expensive section, I think. The approaches to the bridge involve a large amount of expense; but I am not able to say at this moment how much. I should imagine, however, that the cost will be something, at all events, like the average.

Mr. WATSON. Who will own this bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The towns of Emerson and West Lynne. I understand they agreed to construct and furnish the roadway through those places.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose they also bind themselves to keep the bridge in repair?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so; but I do not know what arrangement is made under this head.

Mr. BLAKE. This additional allowance makes the salary of Mr. Schreiber, $6,000 for the Intercolonial, and $2,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or $8,000 in all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is only $6,000 in all. All Mr. Schreiber received as Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition to his salary as an officer of the Department, as General Manager of Government Railways in Operation, and as Chief Engineer, was $1,500; and this is raised to $2,000, or $6,000 in all.

Mr. BLAKE. And what is his salary exclusive of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was $4,000 originally, and has been that since 1873.

260. Grenville Canal—To pay award in favor of Heney, Stewart & Co., contractors, for works at Greece's Point..... $17,270.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the award of the arbitrator. The contractors were not making sufficient progress with the work and the contract was taken out of their hands. They put in a claim for the amount of work performed and the materials on hand, and it was agreed that this should be referred to Mr. Page as sole arbitrator, and this was his award.

Mr. BLAKE Were they entitled to a claim of this kind under the terms of the contract? Had they originally claimed some sum?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that it has always been the practice with regard to the canals, that when the work was taken out of the hands of the contractors they should be paid for the work done and the materials on hand at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the contract be completed having regard to Heney, Stewart & Co.'s tender or not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid not. Their prices were too low, and that was the reason they broke down.

Mr. BLAKE. Had they given security?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They had made a deposit.

Mr. BLAKE. And that has gone too?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The deposit has gone, the Government has got nothing, and the execution of the work costs more than if the contract had been completed. When was the work taken out of their hands?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The 1st of November, 1881.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the contract sum of Heney, Stewart & Co.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be able to give the hon. gentleman that information on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to get the amount of the contract, the security given for the contract, the amount and nature of it, the payments made on account of Heney, Stewart & Co. during the progress of the contract, the disposition of the deposit or other security, and the estimated loss to the Government upon the completion of the works by the new arrangement. It seems to me that this is hardly an illustration which the hon. gentleman would quote in the arguments he was addressing to the Committee in an earlier portion of the evening.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to that, in my judgment it is not possible to get public works constructed at the cost of private individuals. The hon. gentleman will not find, in the management of contracts under the Govern-