

Supply—Harbours and Rivers

Public Works chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Yarmouth harbour dredging, \$22,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The whole list of harbours and rivers for Nova Scotia included in this item has been passed with the exception of the last item, Yarmouth harbour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As regards "appropriations not required for 1924-25, \$338,134.60," how much of that represents work done and how much represents lapsed votes?

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): \$273,973 represents work done.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What do the appropriations consist of for work not done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will hand the list to my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to see what lapses there have been, because it is really necessary that we should have that information if we are to study the effect of the estimates. My hon. friend gives me a list of harbours in Nova Scotia chargeable to income and that list shows the amount of expenditure and the amount of appropriation. It is a long list and the best thing would be to put it on Hansard, but I hesitate to do so. Take for instance Portugese Cove; there was an appropriation of \$5,000 for a breakwater there and only \$10.50 was spent. I take it that the work was abandoned.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I presume that the work was abandoned and the expenditure was therefore unnecessary. I shall inquire.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I just wanted to find out why only \$10.50 was spent, but the obvious inference is that the work was abandoned. In the other instances I presume the difference between the expenditure and the amount voted is a mere matter of valuation. Take Bear River for instance: there was an appropriation of \$13,350 for the rebuilding of a warping pier and only \$7,313.68 was spent. What is the explanation of the difference?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The sum of \$7,000 odd was spent in rebuilding warping piers at the highway bridge both upstream and down and the difference is due to a decrease in the cost of material and the fact that the work was not as extensive as had been anticipated.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then take the next item, Chimney Corner, where there was an appropriation of \$13,400 for the completion of a wharf. Only \$11,885.39 was spent.

Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We had a better tender than we expected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the work that was destroyed by the storm?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And we are doing it over this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How do you account for the difference between \$15,100 of an appropriation and \$11,157.22 expended in dredging at Digby?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was less earth excavated than was anticipated. The estimated extent of the excavation involved was 13,000 cubic yards whereas the actual quantity removed was 10,522.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are not going to do that this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The next item is "Ecum Secum—Completing wharf and building road." We appropriated \$6,100 and no expenditure has been made. I take it that the work was found unnecessary.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The question has not been decided as to the proper location for the wharf and no expenditure has been made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At Point Aconi for the breakwater there was an appropriation of \$10,000 but only \$39.55 was spent. We cannot build a breakwater for \$39. I suppose it was found that this was all they would spend for the time being.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The price of material was too high and no expenditure was made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And no vote is asked for this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At Ship Harbour for wharf repairs we voted \$4,200. That item has been dropped. Has that been otherwise looked after or is it dropped altogether in this year's estimates?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As I stated the other night, there was an error in the wording of the vote last year, but the minister in explaining the estimate to the House indicated what it was for. However, the Auditor General took exception to the wording of the vote, and that is why we are now asking for a re-vote.