

proceeded with this year that timber will be useless and considerable loss will be entailed on the department. I trust the minister will provide for these works in his supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. I will give the request of the hon. member consideration. I am told that the lumber can be stored and used in the work later. There appear to be very few constituencies in which I have given full satisfaction as regards expenditure. We can only do the best we can.

Mr. KYTE I am not criticising the action of the minister; I am simply calling his attention to these important works the repairing of which will not be costly. I may tell the minister that there are no facilities there for storing the timber and there is a chance of it being lost during storms, it is difficult to secure it in its present position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister told us he found a great many useless works going on when he entered the department.

Mr. MONK. I found a great number of works going on under conditions of extravagant expenditure. I did not say useless works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I was going to ask him if he could assure the committee that the works in Nova Scotia, for which he is now asking us to vote money are of a useful character, and if not, which of them can be dispensed with.

Mr. MONK. I do not know that any of these works can be called useless works, but there are some more urgent than others. There are port improvements that are far more urgent than some of these small works, but that does not mean that the smaller works are useless. We are threatened at the present time with the loss of very valuable trade because our principal ports are not properly equipped, and I believe we could more or less delay some of the smaller works, unless they are absolutely urgent, so as to equip our great ports to enable us to keep trade in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman makes careful inquiry he will find there is a great deal of merit in everyone of these public works which were provided for in the estimates last year.

Mr. MONK. There were some useful works on which a great many men were employed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And in many cases it is better to employ a considerable number of men so as to hurry the work along. I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will follow my good example, and will find

Mr. KYTE.

that at proper times he can employ a considerable number of men to hurry along a public work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If there is any extravagant expenditure connected with any of these public works the minister has the power to stop it, and he should do so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), has on many occasions in the past delivered speeches urging that the recommendations of the transportation commission should be carried out by the government. Does he intend to pursue that policy now that he is in office? If I remember well, the commissioners reported in favour of the nationalization of certain of our ports. Is my hon. friend going to select the national ports, and to declare his policy on the subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, but I must again remind him of the rule restricting debate to the item under consideration.

Mr. CARROLL. There were a good many items last year for public works in South Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. There were a number of little breakwaters for which appropriations were made and for which we had voted five-twelfths of the estimates before the holidays. None of these are of great national importance, but each one is very materially important to the particular locality interested. For example, there was an appropriation of \$1,000 for a wharf at Albert Bridge. Albert Bridge is on the Mira river, about 30 miles from a railway station and the river is the only means, outside of trucking 25 miles to the railway station, by which the inhabitants can send out their products to the Louisburg and Sydney Railway. This is only a small country place, and it is almost impossible for the people there to get their products out or bring merchandise in unless they have a wharf. Last year this riding was represented by a Conservative—a good man and a friend of my own—and he says he impressed on the government of that day the necessity of voting some money to build a wharf at that bridge. The House voted that amount but now I find the item dropped. I have the same thing to say concerning Gabarous Harbour. There was an estimate of \$5,000 altogether for some extensions or protection work at that harbour. There was also an item for a wharf at Marion Bridge on the Mira river which is further up the river by about ten miles than the wharf at Albert Bridge. That also has been dropped. That is a large country district, and at present the people there have to wade into the water to meet a little steamer before they can put anything on board it. That is a great hardship, and I do not think the district engineer could have reported against either of those two