

Mr. CROCKET. I was proceeding to say that this expenditure was made for the benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company, and I relied for proof of that statement upon the returns which I obtained from the Department of Public Works itself. I have shown, all through the correspondence, that it was at Mr. Osman's request that the work was done; it was for the shipment of gypsum for the company and not only that, but the first expenditure that was made was made by the company themselves, and it was recouped to them out of the public treasury, for work performed entirely under Mr. Osman's direction before any inspector or contractor had been put upon it to represent the Public Works Department. So far as the member for Westmorland's statement is concerned that this wharf will be used by fishing boats in Shepody bay, that is entirely beside the question, because it is not such a wharf as would have been built for the accommodation of fishing boats. Is there any question, from the return I have read, that this wharf was built to suit the particular purposes of the Albert Manufacturing Company? I am as anxious as any body to see industries in the province of New Brunswick developed, we are all anxious to see industries developed; but when companies are promoted to establish industries which are presumed to be profitable, is it the policy of this government to build wharfs for such companies? If that is their policy, then let us go on and grant bonuses out of the public treasury for these companies. But that has not been the policy heretofore—avowed, anyway, although it is the practice that has been adopted in many places, to make these grants for the promotion of the interests of private companies. Now my hon. friend sought, as has been sought in so many other cases, to justify this by stating that some Conservatives approved of this expenditure. I do not care whether any Conservative carried around a petition or not. The hon. gentleman sought to justify the Newmarket canal appropriation the other night, upon the ground that there was a Conservative or two in the delegation that appeared before him as Minister of Railways. Is that all the evidence this House wants to dispose of a statement of this kind, that some Conservative was in favour of the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to show that it was non-political.

Mr. CROCKET. I have never been able to find in the returns any petition, it may be there is such a petition, but I am quite sure it is not in the return that has been brought down. But surely it is not enough to defend a transaction of this kind to say that some people petitioned for it. I say  
Mr. EMMERSON.

there is no manner of doubt, I make that statement upon the return furnished by the Department of Public Works, that the wharf extension was built primarily at the request of Mr. Osman for the benefit of the company of which he is a director, and this is what the hon. member has not been able to refute. But surely the hon. member for Westmorland does not seriously expect this House to take the statement he has made this afternoon with reference to this question as a refutation of the statements which are contained in an official return brought down by the Department of Public Works. Now my hon. friend has referred to Mr. Osman, following the line of his friend and successor in the Cabinet, and has spoken eulogistically of Mr. Osman.

I am not saying anything in criticism of Mr. Osman; I am criticising the Public Works Department. Mr. Osman, I assume, is like many other people—if they can get their property improved out of the public treasury they will do it, particularly if they have a pull with the minister in charge. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) has referred also to Mr. Downey. I was not making any reference to Mr. Downey's experience or capacity. I simply stated what the return showed—for I have my information, nor from any communication from that section but from the files of the department—that this work was carried on for the first year absolutely under the management and control of Mr. Osman and a foreman appointed by him. The expenditure was incurred in that way, much of it for supplies that appeared, from the Auditor General's Report, to have been furnished by the company itself. The accounts for these supplies were sent by the company to the Department of Public Works. Just as if the work had been carried on under the direction of the government which was not the fact. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) referred to the fact that Mr. McFadden was a very estimable gentleman. Of course, all these inspectors are very estimable gentlemen and are always able to get certificates of character from the member for the county and also from the minister responsible for the appointment. I know nothing about Mr. McFadden except that the hon. member for Westmorland recommended him as inspector on a work long after it was begun, and that the minister of the day had him appointed as inspector and then, to suit Mr. Osman, a foreman whom he had appointed and who had carried on the work solely under his direction, was appointed as conductor or foreman of the work just as before. The engineer reported that this would be satisfactory to Mr. Osman and it was done to suit Mr. Os-