

who had some 30 years' experience in the business. He was recommended as a foreman to see that this work was carried on in accord with the specifications and plans, and I venture to say that McFadden saw that the work was properly done. The original work was done under the charge of Mr. Isaac Downey.

Mr. FOSTER. Who appointed Downey?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was accepted as foreman by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. While the work was going on?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. The facts are these. Downey had done the work originally for the Albert Manufacturing Company. Mr. Downey is a man of many years experience in constructing wharfs and breakwaters on the mud flats of the Shepody river and Bay of Fundy. Mr. Osman secured him as a foreman, knowing his qualifications and ability. There is not a man at the head of the Bay of Fundy more capable in work of that character. When I was consulted, I felt it would be to the advantage of the department, if that work were carried on by day labour, to have a man of the standing and character of Mr. Downey in charge. The money was not forthcoming, and the Albert Manufacturing Company did pay it, and it was recouped to them.

Mr. FOSTER. While the work was being carried on, and Mr. Downey was supervising it, was he supervising it for the company, or had he been already appointed, and was he supervising it for the department?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was accepted as head workman for the department.

Mr. CROCKET. In the following year, after the payment of the two thousand dollars.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in connection with that; that was in connection with the first work that was done and paid for by the government. The original work, the nucleus of a wharf, was constructed by the Albert Manufacturing Company, and as I understand it, that has never been paid for by the government. That is an investment that they made, that is a contribution that they made towards the development of this industry at that place, and they have never asked to be recouped. I think they might have fairly done so, I think if justice were done them in the matter of the development of this work, that amount should be recouped to them. But the additional work is being constructed, and it is proposed to build a further work, not only in the line of an L, but in the line of a breakwater to break the seas from the southwest that roll in there

from the Bay of Fundy. There are fishing establishments there, there are lumber mills, and they have never had the facilities for shipping. This is the first of the kind. There is not from the extreme point of the Cape Meranguin, which separates Chignecto basin and the Shepody basin, clear around the shores to the waters of the Dorchester river, there is not to be found any shipping facilities for either stone or lumber, or agricultural products, or anything of the kind. In a distance of some 12 of 15 miles, this will be the only harbour, and will afford the only shipping facilities, or wharf facilities, or breakwater. I am sure that this is in the general interest of the country, I am sure that it is a work that can be justified. It is not in any sense, I say it in all sincerity, a work for a private individual or a private corporation. It is not so recognized in the county of Westmorland. I make this challenge, that there is not a man on either side of politics in that section of Westmorland, either in the parishes of Dorchester or Sackville, who would hint at such a thing, much less approve the statement or the insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) this afternoon. It is not necessary that I should defend the department; they need no defence, and if they did, the hon. the minister can attend to that part of the business. I am speaking here as a citizen of Westmorland who knows the facts and conditions, and I think it is but fair that hon. members of this committee should know the facts. There is nothing political, there is nothing savouring of favouritism to any friend, individual, or corporation.

Mr. CROCKET. It is not surprising that the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), who has been in this thing from the beginning, should attempt to defend this transaction in the House. He started out by saying that he was going to refute some of my statements, but I leave it to this committee to say whether a single statement of mine has been refuted by the hon. gentleman. It is true that he has elaborated upon the development of the industries of the province of New Brunswick, and has shown how important it is that assistance should be given to the development of such industries as that of the Albert Manufacturing Company. What has that to do with this case? My statement was that this expenditure was made for the benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company—

Mr. EMMERSON. And my statement was that it was made for the benefit of the people in that section of the country wherein the industry was being developed, and which could not have been developed without the construction of this wharf.