

of the maritime provinces, and I was told I was out of order. Now, I think we ought to consider Ontario estimates this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member (Mr. Owen) is quite right. But I was asked a question by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who entered into a discussion, and another hon. gentleman asked me about the resident engineer of the wharf at Richibucto.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In discussions on the estimates, I am always disposed to give a wide interpretation to the rule, and allow as free and broad a discussion as possible. In the present case, I think the discussion has gone beyond what is relevant to the item. The item of Gaspereau can be referred to to illustrate or apply to the present item. But the discussion has not taken that form, and the point of order is well taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) asked me a question about Richibucto wharf, and I felt that it would be discourteous of me not to reply to an hon. member who is always so courteous as my hon. friend. He will be glad to know, I am sure, that we can keep 200 feet of the Richibucto property, which will give us 400 feet on the Richibucto river, and afford good railway and terminal facilities, and sell the remainder of the property for \$3,500. We have a positive and distinct offer of that amount. I shall not further trespass upon your consideration.

Mr. CROCKET. I regret very much to be compelled to say that the statement the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) has made of the arrangement with the Maritime Dredging Company in regard to Gaspereau is incorrect. I challenge proof.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot be allowed to re-open the question unless he specifically applies it to the item under discussion.

Mr. CROCKET. This refers to dredging, and the dredging work throughout the country—

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be an item for dredging generally.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the discussion has proceeded further than it ought to have done, and is declared to be out of order, it will not do to refer back to the words of one particular speaker and make those words a reason for continuing the discussion. At present, the item under discussion is the river St. Lawrence. Any reference to similar work elsewhere that can be brought to bear upon this item is in order,

but the discussion of other items for the purpose of considering whether the expenditures under those votes were well or wisely made will not be in order. I have ruled that the discussion on Gaspereau or other items for that purpose is not in order. I hope the hon. member will not discuss it in that sense. If he can apply his argument to the item under discussion, it will be received.

Mr. CROCKET. I did not hear the whole of the present discussion, but I understood that the item was one for dredging in Ontario. We are discussing the policy and practice of the department with regard to dredging contracts, and we have a very illuminating case in the province of New Brunswick which I think the House should be fully seized of, so that hon. members may determine precisely how these dredging works are being handled by the Public Works Department. I had not intended to intervene in this discussion at all, and would not have done so but for the statement that the Minister of Public Works made with reference to the terms of the contract under which the dredging at Gaspereau river was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) think that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was not equal to the question. I spoke in answer to him.

Mr. CROCKET. I am referring, not to what the hon. member for Hamilton said, but to what the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) said. He stated that the arrangement with the Maritime Dredging Company should—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROCKET. I think I am perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must rule in this sense—that when an hon. member has been called to order for speaking of matters that are not relevant to the question before the committee, it is not allowable for others to discuss what that hon. gentleman has said, and which has been ruled out of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) may, perhaps, take up Gaspereau or some other item in a way to make it applicable to the item under discussion. But he is not at liberty to discuss what the minister said since what the minister said has been declared to be out of order. The point of order having been raised and decided, is not open to discussion.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the objection was taken only to the matter of the Richibucto wharf. I was confining my remarks entirely to the question of dredging,