

the accommodation of the post office there is entirely inadequate, and that the public interests are suffering because the postmaster has not room for the disposition of his mail; and I would like to suggest, if we must wait another year for the vote for the building and still another year for its erection, whether it would not be advisable to build a temporary addition to the present post office, so that during the two years that we shall have to wait for the public building, the public will have accommodation for the post office; that is, if it is possible to use the money already voted to relieve the necessities of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The claims of Chilliwack were earnestly pressed upon me by the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor) predecessor. I do not think the hon. gentleman can press them more strongly. And I was impressed with those claims, and steps were taken in the direction—

Mr. HUGHES. How?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the purchase of a site. I trust we may be able to arrange to go on with the building. As to making an addition to the present building, if the accommodation is not sufficient and the Postmaster General requests it, it might be possible to make an arrangement to have an addition made to the building by the owner and an additional rent paid that would compensate them. But, as the building is a rented one, my department could hardly undertake to make additions.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The building is owned by the postmaster. There is a vacant lot at the side of the post office. It would be perfectly feasible to make an addition to the building at no great cost. In the thirty-seven years we have been in confederation the revenues of this government from Chilliwack have been very large. It is not fair to a city of such importance that after thirty-seven years there should be no public building when the government is able to lavish such large appropriations in public buildings elsewhere.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice there is \$28,000 for 1908-9 and \$5,000 for 1909-10. Was that \$28,000 expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. HUGHES. And is the same true of the \$150,000 for the public building in Vancouver?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the amount is to finish it up.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—harbours and rivers—Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, \$600,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue these works. The work at Port Arthur consists of the extension of a scheme of breakwaters, essential for the protection of shipping in the harbour, and also a good deal of dredging.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any room for dredging there after all that has been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The demand is coming from the people of Port Arthur and Fort William, as well as from Winnipeg and the west, for the deepening of these harbours to 25 feet. It was originally supposed that 22 feet would be sufficient.

Mr. HUGHES. What is being done to the old breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It remains and we are building the new work outside so as to give more room in the harbour. Later on part of the old breakwater will be torn away with the same view of affording more room. In Fort William the work is being done on a large scale. The Mission river is being deepened and widened and a turning basin is being made covering about thirty acres. This work is being done in connection with the terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I am glad to say that that company is laying out its terminals on a very comprehensive scale, involving an expenditure of several millions of dollars. They are building an elevator of very large capacity, and their plans involve providing storage capacity for over 20,000,000 bushels. The contract for dredging is let, providing for a depth of 25 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the depth of the Sault canal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only 21 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the depth of the American canal at the Sault?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The new canal, it is contemplated, will have a depth of 24 feet. But the report that comes to us from the railway companies and the boards of trade of the west is that the vessels upon the lakes are constantly growing larger and that if we are to hold the trade for these ports of Fort William and Port Arthur we must afford a depth of 25 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be better to provide the waterway to the eastward first; would it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily. Vessels in these harbours may not load entirely at one dock. Consequently, at some times the stern may be deeper in the water than it will be when the cargo is complete and the vessel on a level. With a depth of 22 feet these vessels are likely to ground. These are the reports that come to us, and I think they can be relied upon.