

political meetings. At the expense of Canada they were taken in trucks from place to place to attend political meetings. But, as I say, I am not concerned particularly with the past. I am, however, anxious and determined that the administration of the Public Works department, so long as I am responsible for it, shall be clean and creditable to this government and creditable to the House of Commons. I think reflections upon the government reflect also upon the House of Commons, and I welcome the information my hon. friend has given me. I want to say to him and to every hon. member of the house that if irregularities come to light, matters of dishonesty anywhere in Canada in connection with the department over which I have the honour to preside, I shall be pleased, if information is furnished me, to make investigations and prosecutions regardless of party connections.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister very much for his very satisfactory explanation. I wish to add that with full knowledge of what has happened, in my constituency to my knowledge such a thing has never happened before. May I state to him, as I stated on a previous occasion when I was making recommendations to the department, that I do not want the minister to deal harshly with anybody. Very often I have helped men who had voted against me and from whom I had nothing to expect. They were only acts of a humane nature, and the only reason I have spoken as I have is that I want things done properly in my county. Whether the minister decides to spend \$100,000 or \$25,000 in my constituency, I want the expenditures to be made for the actual purpose for which they are intended. Up to last August I do not think the department had any complaint about the work done in my constituency. I have taken the trouble to recommend people who were worthy of recommendation. Hon. ministers previously at the head of the Department of Public Works would be in a position to inform the hon. gentleman in that respect.

Last year a substantial amount of money was voted to put metal sheeting on the wharf at Rivière du Loup, for the purpose of protecting the wharf against the strong currents at the head of the wharf between Rivière du Loup and the St. Lawrence river. That work has not been done. Payment for it was provided for in the \$22,100 voted last year. May I say that the work done in my constituency after the present government took office last year was done by very lazy fellows who seemed to require five or ten minutes to drive a single nail. I do not know what happened

in other places, but it happened that way in my constituency. They were doing no work; they were prolonging the job only in order to get more money from the department. My constituents understand very well that the party in power can appoint their own men to do work. However, I would ask the minister to give definite instructions to his officers so that good work may be done in the future. Last year the Tory candidate said that the money was not all to be spent last year because certain sums were required this year to build an extension to the wharf. As I am not a civil engineer, I do not know whether that extension is desirable or not, but I believe sincerely that the money voted for that purpose should have been spent along the lines first suggested by the department. Instructions in conformity with the wishes of the department should have been given to the district engineer and through him to the foremen. I hope the money revoted this year will be spent to complete the work begun last year. If that sum is not sufficient I would ask the minister to have more money appropriated in order to have the work completed fully by next fall, as it was primarily intended to be completed last fall.

Again I thank the minister for his courtesy and I would repeat that I do not want him to deal harshly with that man. I mentioned this particular case because of the fact that since a few years ago some very disreputable things have been done in my constituency. I hereby notify the hon. gentleman accordingly.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me that the constituency of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has during this session been very well advertised. I think if the minister would build a station at Rivière du Loup we might proceed more quickly with the work of the committee.

I would like to ask the minister how it happened that a work valued at \$22,000 was done without a contract. My understanding of these matters is that any piece of work involving a sum of money over \$5,000 must be done by contract. Here we have an item of \$22,000 done by day labour. It is all very well to say "I recommended" that in order to give certain people work", but I would like to know if people would not have got work if there had been a contract.

Mr. POWER: That is the trouble, they got work under contract. That is the kick.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Work can be done cheaper the other way, and the work referred to as being done by day labour could have been done by contract.