

that the hon. gentleman is to be translated from the office of Minister of Agriculture to that of Minister of Public Works. I think the hon. gentleman might take the committee into his confidence and tell us whether that rumour is true or not. If we felt that he was going himself to expend this money, we would feel greater confidence in the statements he is making with respect to these votes, because we would know that he would be in a position to carry them out, and we believe that he would make a really earnest and honest attempt to carry them out. So it would shorten the discussion on this item if the hon. gentleman would get up and make a clean breast of it, and tell the committee whether or not he is going to be Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is expressing the hope with so much confidence that it tempts me very much. I am not in a position to make any such statement, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that whatever minister is dealing with the department, he will be quite sure to try to carry out the intentions of the government and the pledges I have given.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the conduct of the various departments of this government for the last few years is little less than an abuse of parliamentary privileges. We have never had the same minister at the head of it two years in succession. The man under whose supervision we voted the money is not here to tell us how the money has been expended; he is not here to give us the information of the manner in which he has carried out the promises of the government. The acting minister for the time being always falls back on some excuse, saying, Well, the government endeavoured to expend it properly, but I did not make these promises, therefore I am not responsible for the performance of the work. So we do not know where responsibility rests; we have no man to hold responsible. When one minister gives a promise to the House that he will do a certain thing and it is not done according to promise, we have no one whom we can hold responsible. It is getting to be a very grave abuse. We have not had the same minister two sessions in succession. We had Mr. Tarte, who made certain promises, but he went out and he could not be held responsible afterwards. Then we had Mr. Sutherland for a short time, and he went away for his health. Then after that we had Mr. Hyman, who made certain promises, very few of which have been fulfilled, then he goes away for his health. Now we have the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) for the time being. We ought to get down to some stability and be able to hold some one responsible.

Mr. FISHER. I can tell the hon. gentleman that we will try our best to see that  
Mr. FOWLER.

the government is made stable for the next ten years.

Jersey cove—wharf, \$5,200.

Mr. AMES. Is this wharf situated inside or outside the bar which crosses St. Ann's harbour?

Mr. FISHER. It is on the north eastern side of the harbour, at the angle formed between the beach and the mainland. I cannot say whether it is inside or outside.

Mr. AMES. If it is on the inside, as I think it is, it is to the west of the bar which crosses St. Ann's harbour, where there is a shallow bay filled with eel grass with two or three feet of water, with an impassable mountain at the back of it, and no inhabitants. It is a useless expenditure of money.

Mr. FISHER. I think from the hon. gentleman's account of the situation it must be on the outside of the bar, because there are twelve feet of water at the end of the wharf.

Mr. AMES. It is in a place where there is scarcely any population and nothing but a precipitous mountain range behind it. I think we ought to know where the cove is situated before we vote the money, because that section of Cape Breton county is dotted with useless wharfs from one end to the other.

Mr. FISHER. The work is now under contract.

Mr. AMES. On all sides of St. Ann's harbour are wharfs which are not used and which are the laughing stock of the people in that section; they are not used except by an occasional fishing boat coming in and out. It is just another wharf started to keep people employed in that section, and is a useless expenditure of public money. I want to point out another fact that the government has not apparently considered this to be a very necessary expenditure, as it has been revoted year after year, and each successive year the expenditure seems to be a little higher. When the work was first proposed we were told it would only cost \$4,100; that was in 1905. In 1906 we were told it would cost \$4,300; this year we are told it will cost \$5,200. I do not suppose the work will be done this year unless we have a general election next fall so next year we will have the minister telling us it will cost \$5,500 or \$6,000.

Mr. FISHER. There was an estimate that it would cost \$4,500 before the contract was let. The order in council authorizing the contract was dated 12th of October, 1906, the amount of the contract being \$4,620. We have had to add a little for incidental expenses, which makes up the amount mentioned here. My hon. friend will remember that