

Mr. SPROULE. Look at the expenditure. In 1903 there was an expenditure of \$2,958, in 1904 an expenditure of \$19,950, in 1905 an expenditure of \$9,999, last year we voted \$15,000 and now we have another vote of \$15,000, and all by day's work. Does not the minister see that this is a way of expending money that would hardly meet with the approval of any intelligent man in this country? I do not see how it can be justified at all.

Mr. FISHER. That was the recommendation of the engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. How many foremen have you in connection with this work?

Mr. FISHER. One foreman and one inspector—James McDonald.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are two time-keepers, I see.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two time-keepers, a sub-foreman and a foreman.

Mr. FISHER. The department does not give these titles to the men. There is a superintendent of the work, whom we call an inspector, and he employs the men and is responsible for the work.

Mr. SPROULE. You have an inspector getting \$3.50 a day, and a sub-foreman getting \$2.50, and two time-keepers at \$2.50, and other men getting \$1.60 and \$1.70 a day.

Mr. FISHER. That is not out of the way; I suppose the leading workmen get more than the others.

Mr. J. D. REID. If this work had been done by contract it would have been done within a reasonable time, and whatever benefits the people are to get from it would accrue to them. It probably will last eight or ten years under this system.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no.

Mr. J. D. REID. Pending completion, is there any benefit derived from the work?

Mr. FISHER. Yes; but, of course, there will be greater benefit when it is completed.

Round Hill wharf—to complete, \$1,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What will this cost?

Mr. FISHER. About \$2,000 altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. On this small work you have a Mr. Armstrong who is described as a conductor; you have a foreman at \$3 a day, and a sub-conductor at \$2.50 a day. Why do you require so many inspectors on a little work that will cost \$3,000?

Mr. FISHER. We have to employ an inspector whether the work costs \$3,000 or \$10,000. Some of the workingmen are paid a little more and some a little less. The Auditor General may call these men by

what titles he likes, but the department does not recognize that. It is quite possible that these men may have been on the work at different periods of time, but I cannot explain without having the accounts before me. I can quite understand that some skilled men would be paid \$2.50 a day, while some others are paid less. I have paid men \$2.50 a day on my own barn, and they were well worth it, while I was paying others only \$1.50. The department only recognizes one inspector, who does not do manual work. These accounts have to be certified by the inspector, then by the resident engineer, as being reasonable, then by the chief engineer, and then they pass the Auditor General. With all these checks, I should think that the prices charged are reasonable.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue from this wharf?

Mr. FISHER. We do not hand it over to the Marine Department until it is finished.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will there be any revenue from it?

Mr. FISHER. I hope so.

Mr. J. D. REID. When does the minister expect the Minister of Public Works back?

Mr. BENNETT. After the London election.

Scotch cove (White point) breakwater, \$10,000.

Mr. AMES. Is this by contract or day labour?

Mr. FISHER. Contract; the contract has not yet been let.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a vote for this last year?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. FISHER. \$27,000.

Tatamagouche—wharf, \$3,000.

Mr. AMES. What will be the depth of water at the Tatamagouche wharf when it is completed?

Mr. FISHER. Twelve feet.

Mr. AMES. At high or low tide?

Mr. FISHER. I think these are all low tides.

Mr. AMES. Is it expected it will be a port of call for steamers or only for small schooners?

Mr. FISHER. 12 feet of water would allow smaller steamers to come in.