

and urged the necessity of immediate repairs being made, on the principle that a stitch in time was profitable economy, particularly in a case such as this. The hon. Minister, however, heeded neither information nor representation, but allowed \$30,000 to disappear almost altogether. He seemed to pay particular attention to this senatorial Cow Bay, where as often as there is a storm there is some damage, and as often as there is damage there is a vote in the Estimates. I fail to see why he does not give the same attention to this particular work at McNair's Cove, because I maintain that for want of such attention, \$30,000 or \$40,000 value of work has been completely lost. The hon. gentleman commenced repairs last year by a vote of \$5,000, when, in fact, there was nothing left to be repaired. The wharf had been swept away, and no trace of it left for any useful purpose; whereas, if he had paid attention when the matter was first brought to his notice, less than \$5,000—\$1,000 in 1880 or 1879 would have saved between \$30,000 and \$40,000. What has been expended is worth nothing at all. Where large vessels sheltered before the wharf was carried away, now, even after the expenditure of \$5,000, the smallest fishing boats cannot get any shelter. I do not think such neglect on the part of the hon. Minister to make timely repairs will add to the reputation his Department has for efficiency and economy. I am far from saying that his Department is not entitled to a reputation for efficient administration; but, as far as the saving or preserving of costly structures like this is concerned, its reputation has actually yet to be earned. This is not the only case I have to complain of. There is another breakwater in the same county which cost \$3,000, and that has nearly gone also—the breakwater at Tracadie. I had the honour to present a petition to the Department early in the Session, and have brought the matter to the hon. Minister's notice every Session for the last few years, and I now assure him that unless some provision be made this Session, the \$8,000 expended on this breakwater will follow the \$30,000 he allowed to be wasted at Cape George. If the breakwater was worth commencing, it is worth preserving. It is far better, in the public interest, not to commence these works at all, if they are to be allowed to disappear in so short a time. There is another work, also in the same county, and the hon. Minister knows all about it—that is the breakwater at Bayfield. Last Session the hon. gentleman was good enough to promise that he would give it his attention this Session and make the necessary provision. I hope he will not forget that promise; \$5,000 was expended in 1878, commencing the work, and unless it is now looked after immediately, that \$5,000 will be gone also. The hon. Minister of Railways knows all about these works. In 1882 he did us the honour, in my county, to pay us a visit, and he gave us a very eloquent address, during which he enumerated these public works—St. George, Tracadie and Bayfield—described their dilapidated condition, and said the only thing he needed to make the required provision for these public works was the assistance of the representative of the county to vote the money. I can assure him I am ready to assist him to vote all the money required, and I think that I can assure him the assistance of hon. gentlemen on this side to carry out that side of the bargain.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not sure I will agree to assist in any corrupt bargain.

Mr. McISAAC. I am not disposed to call it corrupt; it is only a delayed duty on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways, and I must ask and insist, if my insistence will be of any avail on the hon. Minister of Public Works, that he should save at least what is left of the money that he and others have expended on these public works. He commenced these works himself, and I say again he should not have commenced these structures if he thought they would

not be worth preserving. I trust when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, the necessary provisions will be found in them to make these absolutely necessary repairs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon friend has put the matter a little too broadly. I do not think I stated quite in those very distinct terms the case as he has put it, but I must say that the gentleman whose interests I was advocating at the time, the gentleman whom I was supporting in that county at that time, as a candidate for this House, has since been elected by a very large majority in that county as a successor to the present Judge Thompson, who now graces the Bench of Nova Scotia; and I might tell my hon. friend that it would be impossible for his advocacy to be stronger or more pressing on the Minister of Public Works in regard to these works than the pressure that is constantly brought to bear upon him by the hon. gentleman's colleague for that county in the Local Legislature. I am in hopes that between them they will be able to induce my hon. friend here to take such measures as will prevent any further injury to these works and make them as useful as possible.

Mr. McISAAC. Does the hon. gentleman say that the only merit the works possess is the fact of their being advocated by a gentleman who represents the county in the Local Legislature?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I do not. I do not see what the hon. gentleman means. He does not mean to say that the only merit the works have is the fact that he is advocating them in this House?

Mr. McISAAC. I am asking whether the only value which he attaches to these works is the fact that aid is asked for them by a gentleman in the Local House?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say no. I say the works themselves are important, very important, but the hon. gentleman is very well aware that there are a great many very important works in this country that it is not possible to grapple with at the same time; but I have said before, and I express again the hope that the strong appeal the hon. gentleman has made, and the still stronger appeals that have been continuously made by his colleague in the local branch of the Legislature, will succeed in duly impressing my hon. friend here, and I can assure him that my advocacy and support will not be wanting in anything that can be done to promote the advancement and the security and the extension of those important works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister of Railways forgot to tell us exactly what he did promise during the election. We would like to know that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it would not be edifying for us all to give our experience and fight our battles over again, and restate what we have said in the course of a parliamentary campaign. I am afraid, although I think my memory is tolerably accurate, I could hardly rely on it for minute details in a matter of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will take it confidentially.

Mr. MILLS. It is rather a novel statement that the Minister of Railways makes that the importance of these works is being pressed on the Government by a gentleman who has been elected to another Legislature for the performance of other duties. Why does the hon. gentleman take such pains to inform the House that that gentleman, besides discharging the duties he is elected to discharge by the electors, has undertaken to discharge the duties which devolve on the gentleman who is elected for that purpose in this House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. member (Mr. McIsaac) did not notify me that he would bring