

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN Yes, everything outside of interest and provision for sinking fund.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the orders of the day being called:

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before the House a matter of privilege. On the 14th instant, the hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) read an extract from the Toronto 'Globe' of a day or two before, as follows:

By reading extracts from some documents and carefully refraining from reading others he sought to convey the impression that money was being taken from the public treasury and spent upon a wharf at Pink Rock owned by a company managed by a political friend of the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley destroyed Mr. Crocket's pretty little piece of political patchwork at one blow by producing an agreement which showed that the wharf had passed from the hands of the company referred to by the member for York into those of the Crown, and that the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

The hon. member for York is reported as making the charge that the statement in the Toronto 'Globe' was untrue, and stating also that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) knew it was untrue. It is with regard to the latter assertion of the hon. member that I feel it my duty to bring the matter before the House as a matter of privilege. I may say, as the hon. member appealed to me, that I am unable to corroborate in the slightest degree his statement that the report in the 'Globe' was untrue. I think that, if one takes the whole report, one must conclude that the reporter did give a true account of the state of affairs, so far as the Pine Rock wharf is concerned. It is necessary to read the whole report in the 'Globe' in order to form a correct opinion of the truthfulness or otherwise of it. I will read it more fully, including the paragraphs quoted by the hon. member for York, which I have just referred to:

By reading extracts from some documents and carefully refraining from reading others he sought to convey the impression that money was being taken from the public treasury and spent upon a wharf at Pink Rock owned by a company managed by a political friend of the Minister of Public Works.

The impression which I received from the statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), and I think it was an impression fairly to be received from his language, was that the Public Works Department were expending money on a private wharf which was owned by the Albert Manufacturing Company. The facts of the case are that nothing of the kind has been

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

occurring. Not one single dollar of public money has been expended upon a private wharf. The wharf which is being constructed is wholly the property of the Crown. My hon. friend from York may not have intended to create that impression, and I trust he did not intend to do so, but that was the fair inference to be derived from his language, and it is the inference which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) also drew from his language, because that hon. member made the statement that money was being expended on private property. Therefore, I think that the reporter of the 'Globe' was clearly warranted in drawing that inference from the remarks of my hon. friend. Then the article proceeds:

Hon. Mr. Pugsley destroyed Mr. Crocket's pretty little piece of political patchwork at one blow by producing an agreement which showed that the wharf had passed from the hands of the company referred to by the member for York into those of the Crown, and that the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

I think that the agreement which gives to the Crown the absolute right to collect wharfage tolls, both side wharfage and top wharfage, and which gives to the public the right of way over the property which had been originally constructed by the Albert Manufacturing Company, over that property, to the work which the government was itself constructing beyond the length of the wharf originally built by the Albert Manufacturing Company, entirely justified the reporter of the 'Globe' in stating that the control of the property had passed from the Albert Manufacturing Company into the hands of the Crown, because that is the effect, not only substantially but wholly the effect of the agreement, subject simply to the right of the Albert Manufacturing Company to have its own vessels lie at the wharf free of tolls. Then the reporter further proceeds:

That the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

That statement was also absolutely correct. Therefore, for these reasons I, as I have said, am entirely unable to agree with the member for York (Mr. Crocket) that the report appearing in the Toronto 'Globe' was in any way inaccurate.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). The Minister of Public Works has apparently felt it necessary to do some more explaining, a thing that he has been very frequently called upon to do in this House. He states that he is not able to corroborate the statement of the hon. member for York on Monday last, that the statement in the 'Globe' newspaper was untrue. If