

Mr. CROCKET. There is an agreement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It gives a free right of way.

Mr. CROCKET. And the right to charge wharfage on all other vessels except their own?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, not only vessels lying at the new wharf, but lying at the old wharf, except those of the company.

Mr. hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) with that unhappy faculty he has of seeing something suspicious in everything which is done by a political opponent, suggests this extraordinary fact that Mr. Osman after it had been supposed it would be necessary to build a wharf which would cost \$15,000, actually suggests it would be well to reduce it and bring the cost within the appropriation of \$5,000 for that year. And so, said the hon. member, that that work might not only go on at once and be done by day labour—

Mr. CROCKET. That is what the correspondence says.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend knew perfectly well that Mr. Osman gives an explanation in one of the letters he had in his hand. He said that at that time he supposed the extension of 47 feet would be sufficient by dredging out a berth for the vessels beside the wharf, and that it would not be necessary to go to the further expense, but he says that the masters of three ships which the company had chartered to load plaster refused to go to the wharf because it was not extended out far enough and did not afford sufficient shelter, and that is the reason and the only reason why the plans were afterwards changed, and we went back to the original design to build out 75 feet and also build a breakwater to make a safe harbour. And yet with the copies of the letters in his hand, the hon. member thought it was proper to make the insinuation—

Mr. CROCKET. I read the very letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY—and that is the time I was obliged to ask the hon. member to raise his voice so that we on this side of the House could hear him.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister give the dates when the extension was asked, when the department decided to carry out the extension of the work, when the work commenced, and when Mr. Downey was appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not all these particulars now but can procure the dates. The application was made in 1906; the project was submitted to the chief engineer to build an extension on July 30, 1906. The work was begun in 1907, and 1908 when I think it was decided to build only the 47 foot extension.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that order given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time in the fiscal year 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. These dates will tell the whole story.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Later on, I think in the following year, it was decided to build the extension when it was represented by Mr. Osman that vessel owners had refused to come to the wharf. I think the reasons given by Mr. Osman were amply sufficient and that we were justified in deciding to make the extension because it would be useless to expend that money unless the public could be accommodated. I do not intend to go into the details of these accounts beyond saying that it will be found there is a letter from Mr. Osman, in which, speaking of the timber, he says that if the timber is cut off the company's land it will be got at a lower cost than elsewhere, and I am sure that those who know Mr. Osman will corroborate what the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has said that he would not have any desire that he or his company should make a dollar out of supplying timber or anything else for this wharf.

I invite members of the committee who feel an interest in this matter to take the account to be found at page V-187 of the Auditor General's Report and look at the prices charged and then determine whether or not any excessive price has been paid. I find that for hemlock, 10 x 10, we paid \$13 a thousand. I think no one will say that that is not a reasonable, that it is not a cheap price.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the price that is paid but the principle, the man buying from himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Round hemlock timber at \$9 a thousand. I venture to say \$3 a thousand less than it could be bought from any one else. Square spruce and hemlock, 1,054 feet at \$13. No one will say that is not a reasonable and fair price. It does seem to me that when you bear in mind that Mr. Osman undertook this work at the request of the responsible head of the department, that he undertook it, as we then thought, in the public interest and that it is not suggested that a single dollar has been paid beyond a fair and reasonable price, and when it is remembered that every account was certified to by the resident engineer in the usual way that the prices were fair and reasonable, I do not see what my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) has to complain of. He says that this is a sample of what is going on in New Brunswick. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he is not able to produce any stronger testimony that