

man's purposes. I read a letter asking if, when Mr. McFadden was appointed as inspector, he would go on and act the same as though a contract had been let, or act as foreman. And, though the practice is to appoint inspectors only where contracts are let, they appointed in this case Mr. McFadden the inspector to inspect the work which was going on by day's labour, with a foreman under him and a subforeman under him. So, the whole matter was worked through exactly as Mr. Osman, the friend of the Minister of Public Works, and of the hon. member for Westmorland, desired. Mr. McFadden got his job as inspector and Mr. Downey held on to his as foreman, just as before. The hon. member for Westmorland stated, and hon. members generally must have observed the statement that the company had built the wharf in the first instance at their own expense to develop their own property as they should have done. Why, then, should this House be called upon to furnish means to extend that property without, at least, the property being taken over and conveyed to the Crown as in other cases? I say that the transaction is indefensible, and notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Westmorland, is one which not only the members of the Conservative party but many Liberals in that district will disapprove. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) said that I could not find a man, Liberal or Conservative, in Westmorland who would find fault with this transaction. I have many communications on this matter, from responsible people, calling my attention to the case and urging it as a case that should be brought to the attention of the House. It is very easy for the hon. member to make such sweeping statements, but those statements are not in accordance with the facts; and I believe he knows it. In any case, the statement of the hon. member does not affect in the slightest degree the proof adduced from the official file that this work was entered upon at the request of Mr. Osman or the manufacturing company of which he is the managing director, that it was for their benefit, and that the work was carried on practically by them and under their direction and control and yet paid for out of the public treasury.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I have listened carefully to this debate. I know nothing about whether this wharf was necessary for the locality or whether it is only to suit private parties. What I was concerned in was the statement made by some hon. members in reference to the payment of money on the wharf. It seems that a certain sum of money was voted to be expended on a wharf in this locality. The gentleman who owns the wharf employed a foreman, Mr.

Oscar Downey, to extend the wharf or make repairs upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to make repairs, but to build an addition.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. At any rate, he makes an expenditure of \$2,100 upon the wharf for labour and supplies on this work. That expenditure was not under the control of the department. I would ask, is there any confirmation of the statement of the hon. member that Mr. Downey was appointed superintendent of this work by the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I will explain, as the hon. gentleman has asked the question. When it was proposed to undertake this work by the day, Mr. Osman was requested to take steps to get material and proceed with the work, and Mr. Downey was suggested by him as foreman and approved by the department. What Mr. Osman did he did for the department, and not upon his own property or upon the property of the Albert Manufacturing Company, but upon the property of the Crown.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. My information is, as shown by the report, that \$2,100 was paid out by Mr. Osman, part of which was in the payment of Mr. Oscar Downey, the foreman, and other men employed in the work, and part for supplies. Mr. Downey was confirmed by the department after the expenditure of the \$2,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that is correct. I may say, it is extremely inconvenient to argue in this Committee of the Whole matters relating to accounts which are now before the Committee on Public Accounts. It is contrary to the rules to do it. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), I am sure, has been speaking of matters which do not appear even in the copy of the papers which he has submitted to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). I have looked them over carefully and find no statements to corroborate what he has said. The hon. member must have got some information from the examination of accounts which are now before the Public Accounts Committee. In that committee, witnesses can be called and the facts brought out. It is exceedingly inconvenient to discuss the matter when we have not the facts before us. I am sure that my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) will see that. It is exceedingly inconvenient to me, because my attention has not been called to the matter. It seems to me that the Committee on Public Accounts, to which these accounts have been referred, is the place where these matters should be discussed.

Mr. CROCKET. As to the statement of the minister that these things do not appear in the papers, I have the letter of Mr.