

deavoured to have the work on the extension carried on in the same way.

It would be very desirable to procure lumber for the extension early this winter, i.e., before the heavy snowfalls, as it can then be bought most cheaply. Would you kindly inform me, therefore, whether I may procure only sufficient lumber for the 47-foot extension, or expend the balance of the appropriation for lumber for the whole proposed work—the estimated cost of which is \$13,000; and also what answer I can return to Mr. Osman.

Yours obediently,

(Sgd.) GEOFFREY STEAD,  
Resident Engineer.

The following is the chief engineer's reply to Mr. Stead, dated 30th November, 1908:

In reply to your letter of the 27th inst., regarding the work at Pink Rock, I have to inform you that you may procure sufficient lumber for the 47-foot extension which you were authorized on the 24th September last to construct by day labour, but not for any other work.

There is another letter dated December 12th, from the chief engineer of the department of the deputy minister, Mr. Hunter, as follows:

Sir,—I have the honour to inclose herewith a memorandum from the hon. the minister asking that attention be given to the work required at Pink Rock, as requested by Mr. C. J. Osman in the accompanying letter. The matter was referred to Mr. Geoffrey Stead, resident engineer, whose report I now have the honour to transmit.

Mr. Stead states that what is necessary is an extension of the wharf 47 feet long and 28 feet wide, with a pier-head or 'L' 75 feet by 23 feet, and a detached breakerwater 100 feet from the end of the 'L,' the estimated cost of the work being \$13,000.

The estimated cost of the 47-foot extension is \$2,830, and by your instructions Mr. Stead was informed, on the 30th ult., that he might procure sufficient lumber for this extension, which he was authorized on the 27th September last to construct by day labour but not for any other work.

So that I think, Mr. Chairman, it must be evident that the statement which was made that the extension of this wharf at Pink Rock was made for the benefit of the company of which C. J. Osman is a director has been pretty well confirmed by the quotations I have made from this return. Not only that, but far worse than the statement I made, it appears that the first year's expenditure of over \$2,100 was made by Mr. Osman himself, who employed his own men to do the work, who purchased his own supplies, and who simply sent up to the Department of Public Works here these bills amounting to that sum of money which were paid out of the public treasury—

Mr. PUGSLEY. He charged actual cost without any profits at all.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not, at the present moment, discussing actual cost. I may have occasion to show what Mr. Osman's idea of actual cost was before I get through, by reference to some items in his accounts. This amount was paid out of the public treasury to Mr. Osman for work done by him without reference to the government and before the Department of Public Works had given any directions or instructions in the matter at all.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Who certified to the amount that was paid to Mr. Osman?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Stead. He simply forwarded the accounts. Mr. Osman sent his accounts in to Mr. Stead.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows more than that. Mr. Stead certified to the accounts.

Mr. CROCKET. I said, that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the hon. gentleman said that Mr. Stead simply forwarded the accounts. He certified to the correctness of the accounts.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked who certified the accounts and I said Mr. Stead.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. I said that Osman forwarded the accounts to Mr. Stead, that Mr. Stead forwarded them to the department at Ottawa and, of course, a certificate 'fair and reasonable' can always be got in every case in New Brunswick—just such a certificate as we had in connection with the Richibucto wharf, and just such certificates as we had in many other cases in New Brunswick which were not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Would that not be a criminal act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would be a criminal act?

Mr. BOYCE. Falsifying a certificate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who said it was falsified?

Mr. J. HAGGART. The money was paid through the Auditor General's Department on a false statement of facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) has not made such a statement.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Then I make the statement based upon his statement of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has no foundation for making that statement, because, even according to the statement