

there is any improper expenditure on the part of the department he will make but little headway in the province from which we both come, and where we are both reasonably well known. I see nothing in this account in regard to which any reflection can be made on the department.

Just a word in regard to another suggestion made in reference to myself. He thought it necessary in the discussion of this item to go a good many miles away to Dalhousie in the county of Restigouche, and to state that the Department of Public Works was dredging out and improving a wharf property which belonged to the Dalhousie Lumber Company of which I happen to be a shareholder. I can appeal to my hon. friend who represents the county of Restigouche (Mr. Reid), a gentleman who stands as high as any other member of this House, as to whether or not the dredging work which was done there was done solely for the benefit of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. The dredge employed by the department was doing the work of improving the harbour of Dalhousie. Well, it is not my fault that I happen to be interested in the Dalhousie Lumber Company. It happened that some years ago I did take some stock in that company. It is my misfortune that, as I have made a little money from time to time, I have not laid it up in savings banks or bought bonds with it, but have invested it in industrial enterprises and in property in different parts of the country. Let me give to my hon. friend a pointer of which he may avail himself when we come to discuss harbour improvements for the city of St. John. Let me tell him that I happen to own property in that city, and he can make as strong a point in regard to the improvements there as he does in regard to the improvements in the port of Dalhousie. From the fact of my owning property in the city of St. John, improvements made in that port will to a certain extent benefit my property as that of every other citizen of that city. Let me give him another pointer. I happen to own property in the Northwest, and when my hon. friend goes back to his constituents, let him tell the people in the back country that all this development which the Minister of Public Works is seeking jointly with his colleagues to bring about in the Northwest, is really going to confer a benefit upon him, and that it is a dreadful thing that he should be interested in properties in various sections of the country which are likely to be benefited by the development which is taking place. But let me tell my hon. friend I am not going to stop making improvements in my department wherever I can develop trade, improve the facilities for doing business, make the people more prosperous and en-

able them to carry on their undertakings to better advantage, because those improvements may indirectly benefit myself as one interested in the community where the work is going on or having some interest in the country at large.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister in reply to a statement made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked what evidence there was that the \$2,018.96 set out in the Auditor General's Report had not been paid in the regular way to the parties therein named. I have already laid before the committee the evidence from the files of the department, namely, a letter from Geoffrey Stead of the 13th of May, 1908, in which he incloses the company's account, amounting to the very sum set out in the Auditor General's Report, and calls attention to the fact that the expenditure was made by the company who were asking the payment to be made to themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this very return which my hon. friend had in his hand, does not Mr. Osman say that he had undertaken this work at the request of the minister, and then asks to be relieved of it and to have some one else take it?

Mr. CROCKET. If there is such a statement, it did not come under my notice. It is entirely new to me that Mr. Osman was asked by the Department of Public Works to construct the extension of their own wharf. If he was, it is very much worse than the case already presented. If the Department of Public Works, without calling for tenders, simply authorized the owner of the wharf to build an extension of his own wharf, and placed the matter absolutely in his control, how is it that the account is set out as it is in the Auditor General's Report? Surely the minister must be mistaken, because if Mr. Osman had authority to do that, the payment would appear as made to him. There is no question, from the return brought down, that this money was expended by Mr. Osman or by the company of which he is managing director, and that account was forwarded to the Public Works Department, and was paid out of the public treasury just as if the work had been constructed under the direction and supervision of the department. The minister has taken occasion to refer to the statement I made in reference to the dredging that was done at Dalhousie, and has stated that he is the owner of considerable property at St. John and in the Northwest, and that there would be just as much justification in my making the statement that he was benefited by the expenditure of his department in the city of St. John and in the Northwest as at Dalhousie. Surely the minister does not expect to deceive this House by such a