

Mr. STEVENS: What has the new shed cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I cannot state that definitely; it is not set out. To complete the shed this year there will be required altogether \$150.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely the minister can give us the information in regard to the vote of last year. I complimented his engineer a moment ago on having given us the details, and that is a splendid thing. Surely he must have the information in regard to the \$8,500.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the details here. It has not been the custom to bring in the explanations of items passed the previous year. I have just the totals showing the expenditures, but I shall be glad to supply the details later.

Mr. STEVENS: If the minister will admit the principle I have stated I can dispense with the details. But in the absence of that information he attempts to justify the building of this shed by day labour. Will he not admit that a shed which must be superimposed on a wharf and is not necessarily a part of that structure is something that could be done by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is heavy traffic over the wharf and as the foundation would unquestionably be disturbed I can quite understand the engineer advising that the work be done by the department.

Mr. STEVENS: That, then, would apply to all these things.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. STEVENS: Apparently it would apply to every item I have touched.

Mr. LEWIS: This discussion comes up every little while and probably rightly so; but if the minister could tell us what the policy is in regard to these particular works the one explanation would be sufficient to cover all cases. Before I came to this country I was a building expert and I have been employed by the government in connection with certain buildings. My experience in the Old Land may be entirely different from the experience of builders here, but I know that we found that on repair work contractors were very cautious where the work could not be seen or was not clearly specified. Under these conditions we always found it much better to do the work departmentally, and the same thing may possibly be true in regard to the present and similar cases.

If, however, there is a recognized principle that works of over \$5,000 should be done by contract there would seem to be some necessity for an explanation from the engineer or from the minister as to why the rule has not been observed in this case. If that explanation were given it would obviate detailed discussion upon each item of this nature. Is the work done in this particular way in consequence of some report from the engineers that it could be more satisfactorily and efficiently performed by day labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the recommendation, yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How much was spent last year on the wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1923-24 there was an expenditure of \$8,693.80.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What was spent the year before?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not that information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have been following half a dozen of these cases and I do not find in the Auditor General's report in any instance the same figures as given by the minister. Every second year there seems to be a difference of between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Would it not be 1922-23?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is for the year before.

Mr. BUREAU: The Auditor General's report would not cover the period up to March 31, 1924.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is what I am saying. Every year there is expenditure on this wharf.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a large work. Item agreed to.

Baie des Rochers—Wharf improvements, \$2,300.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is this new work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is to construct an extension 50 feet by 40 feet joining the inner side of the headblock with the shore, and to close up the span between the headblock and the approach with cribwork 25 feet by 12 feet, and some minor repairs.

Item agreed to.

Baie St. Paul—Wharf, \$12,200.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is required to provide for the contract for construction of a