

estimates. We should have an explanation from the deputy minister.

The CHAIRMAN: He is not in a position to speak.

Mr. PELLETIER: This situation was explained last year and the year before, and the special claim for damages in this item is due to the storm.

Mr. McTAGGART: We should have a general explanation of the necessity for this long list of wharf repairs. I presume that these supplementary estimates are based on the recommendations of the departmental engineers, and apparently the main estimates are based upon the investigations of the engineers last summer. At what time did the engineers cover the ground and make their recommendations in regard to these particular affairs? Was it done in the summer?

Mr. COPP: They make their surveys and gather information and they send in their reports from time to time.

Mr. McTAGGART: Have all these items been recommended by the departmental engineers?

Mr. COPP: Yes, every one of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not yet learned how much this wharf has cost. It has been in the estimates now for three or four years and if there is no election this year it will be in the estimates next year again. What has it cost to date?

Mr. COPP: The total to date is \$86,773.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And \$140,000 more for this year.

Mr. COPP: The sum of \$100,000 is paid by the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why vote \$140,000?

Mr. COPP: The Department of Public Works in their arrangement with the company insisted that they deposit \$100,000. So that as a matter of fact the government is providing only \$40,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the government to be held responsible for damage sustained during construction under these contracts?

Mr. COPP: The contractor is held responsible of course but in any storm of unusual severity he can hardly be held liable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the department in default? Was there any error or laches on the part of the department?

Mr. COPP: No, the department made no mistake. It was an act of God.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We pay the damages for the act of God both to ourselves and to the contractor.

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the contractor?

Mr. COPP: Boulanger.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the name of the inspector?

Mr. COPP: Pelletier, is the name.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is he a son of the late Postmaster General or of the member for the riding?

Mr. COPP: I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Inasmuch as the Postmaster General never had a son, I do not think it is likely that this man was his son. He may be a son of the member for the riding.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the estimated damage by the engineers of the department on this particular work?

Mr. COPP: The amount asked for in the vote.

Mr. GARDINER: Do the contractors bear any part of the damage at all?

Mr. COPP: We are relieving the contractor from the damage for the reasons I have stated. He did his work properly and efficiently.

Item agreed to.

Ontario—	
Bronte—wharf repairs	4,900
Burlington—breakwater extension	9,800
Burlington channel—repairs to north pier ..	3,100
Chatham—repairs to revetment wall—further amount required	7,500
Chute à Blondeau—wharf reconstruction..	7,600
Collingwood—breakwater reconstruction ..	35,000
Honey Harbour—wharf	11,600
Laurenson Lake—dredging	2,000
L'Orignal—contribution towards cost of shore protection, the province of Ontario to contribute a like amount and the municipality—\$1,000	2,000
Meaford—breakwater repairs	9,000
Midland—dredging	58,000
Midland—wharf—further amount required	45,000
New Liskeard—wharf repairs	3,650
Owen Sound—harbour wall	15,000
Port Stanley—harbour improvements and repairs—further amount required	10,000
Rondeau—dredging	32,000
Saugeon River—repairs to harbour works—further amount required	4,000
Sault Ste. Marie—dredging slip	61,000
Windsor—wharf repairs	3,000

324,150