

Geoffrey Stead in which he makes the statement specifically that this expenditure was made by Mr. Osman, that Downey had been appointed by him, and that the accounts, aggregating upwards of \$2,000, he had sent to the department to be paid, and a subsequent letter asking that the work be allowed to go on in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Am I not right in this, that in the copy of the papers which the hon. gentleman handed over to the hon. member for Westmorland there is no account contained?

Mr. CROCKET. The account itself is not there, but he says in his letter that he is inclosing the amount, and here is the account in the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Downey was not appointed until after the expenditure was incurred and paid by the department.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Here is an expenditure of \$2,100 paid in some way by the department. There must have been collusion between some of the officials, or the accounts could not have passed the Auditor General's Department. An improper payment comes under the criminal law. Any party can be prosecuted and punished for the payment of any sum of money out of the treasury of the country in such a manner as this has been paid. The Auditor General's Report would lead you to believe that this \$2,100 was paid in the ordinary form. The Auditor General must have believed that Downey and the other parties were employed under the direction of the Public Works Department, and their payment authorized in the regular way, or he never would have paid the account. If this account is paid, it was because he was deceived by the Department of Public Works, or by some one who gave him the information. The point I want to emphasize is the improper payment of this sum of money. It is claimed that Mr. Oscar Downey was appointed before the expenditure was made. If he was paid before, why does Mr. Osman pay him his wages? Why does he not come to the Department of Public Works for payment? Here we have the payment of the accounts of private individuals amounting to \$2,100, and what I object to—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The payment to Downey and others does appear in the Auditor General's Report. I find in the report:

Conductor, Oscar Downey, 32 days at \$2.50, \$80.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Exactly. It appears in the Auditor General's Report as a payment by the Crown to these individuals, when the fact is, if the statement of my hon. friend from York is correct, the payment was made by Mr. Osman before Mr. Stead issued the instructions from the de-

Mr. CROCKET.

partment to commence the work. I am protesting against the irregularity of this payment. I am not saying whether this public work is necessary or not, because I am not acquainted with the locality. An expenditure for the benefit of a private individual may benefit to a large extent the country around. I am not criticising that at all, but what I am criticising is the expenditure of money voted by this House in the manner in which it has been expended by the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think perhaps I ought to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend. I do appeal to him, and I ask him whether he has any facts before him, or are there any facts before this committee, which would warrant him in saying that there has been some criminal conduct on the part of the officials of the department?

Mr. J. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend seen the accounts?

Mr. J. HAGGART. I saw the accounts in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Here is the Auditor General's statement:

Pink Rock, Shepody bay, New Brunswick:	
Extension of Wharf.	
Inspector, G. S. McFadden, services during May and June, 29 days at \$2.50. . . . .	\$ 72 50
Conductor, Oscar Downey, 32 days at \$2.50. . . . .	80 00
Sub-conductor, Warren Downey: 10 days at \$2; 4-in. planks, 10,477 ft. at \$12; 10x10 hemlock, 1,728 ft. at \$13; ballast, 44.3 yds. at 80c.; scow and 2 men, 19 days at \$8; sundry outlay, \$1.50. . . . .	357 14
Carpenters, 88.4 days at \$2, 91 at \$1.75; labourers, 24 days at \$2, 237.5 at \$1.50. . . . .	740 30
Albert Mfg. Company: rd. hemlock timber, 43,429 ft. at \$9; sq. spruce and hemlock, 10,054 ft. at \$13; bolts, 3,866 lb. at 4c.; towing timber, 13 rafts at \$12; sundries, \$41.54 . . . .	873 74
Small payments: rope, 20 lb. at 18c., 110 at 16c.; spikes, 3 kegs for \$10.50; sundries, \$5.11. . . . .	36 81
King's Printer. . . . .	17 25
	\$2,177 74

Let me ask my hon. friend what there is either in this account or in the copy of the papers which the hon. member for York has produced that shows that there is a single false or erroneous statement as to the expenditure or payment?

Mr. J. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman seems to have misunderstood what I said. This \$2,100 was expended by a private individual on that wharf before instructions were issued by the department for the commencement of the work.