

Mr. HANBURY: What will be the total cost of the construction of that wall?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There is another section remaining to be done, and the probable cost of completing it will be \$8,000 or \$10,000 in addition to the present vote.

Mr. HANBURY: That is the information I wanted. I would call to the attention of the minister that that work carries a very high percentage of man power; the percentage of material is very small. It is work that a great many people who have no other trade can do, and I would suggest to the minister that as a measure of unemployment relief he might consider placing in the supplementaries a further sum for that work which could be expended during the present year or during the winter, if necessary, because the work could be done in the winter on account of our climatic conditions. The work has been done by day labour. We cooperate with the parks commissioners at Vancouver.

Mr. HANBURY: I am suggesting that with a view to unemployment relief this work might be done this year rather than next year, and an item be provided in the supplementaries for that purpose.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to pay a tribute to the enterprise of the engineering department in making a new departure in connection with these floats. During the last year a couple of small scows were built to take the place of floats with the idea that if the experiment proved successful they would adopt the policy. The scows can be built cheaper than the ordinary float. They are built of plank and although they are not creosoted by pressure they are painted with creosote. The creosote is not put on under pressure but is heavily painted and tarred. Unlike the floats the scows have the additional advantage that once a year they can be drawn out of water, retarred and repainted with creosote. If the experiment is successful the use of these scows will enormously decrease the cost which would have been necessary with the use of floats. Of course there is the expense of once a year pulling the scow out, but that is nothing compared with the cost of making a new float. I would like to give credit to the engineering branch of the Department of Public Works for inaugurating an experiment which I hope will be successful.

Mr. HANBURY: I wonder if the minister would tell me why appropriations totalling \$358,260.16 were not spent?

Mr. REID: I notice some items in connection with protection work. Some applications

for protection work have come from the constituency of New Westminster. The farmers in that district are as heavily taxed as farmers anywhere in Canada, paying from \$6 to \$8 per acre. I quite agree with the minister that protection work cannot be done on all rivers, wherever erosion takes place. In many cases however on the Fraser river due to the work of the dredges, erosion has taken place. I wonder if the minister would give me the assurance he gave the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. Munn) that when the supplementary estimates are brought down consideration will be given to applications.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Consideration will certainly be given. I do not know that I promised the hon. member for North Vancouver that anything would be included in the supplementary estimates. I made no such promise to any hon. gentleman, but I will consider the requests which have been made. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Hanbury) I would say the information for which he has asked covers three pages. I am afraid that to read it at the present time would be encumbering the records of Hansard.

Mr. HANBURY: I will be quite content if the minister would furnish me with a copy of the information.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Certainly.

Item agreed to.

Dredging—Maritime provinces, \$350,000.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, \$350,000.

Dredging—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, \$50,000.

Dredging—British Columbia, \$150,000.—

Total, \$900,000.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, under the heading "dredging,—maritime provinces" I see the amount is reduced from \$675,000 to \$350,000. As I distinctly understand the government is attempting to cut down expenditures from a standpoint of economy, it is not necessary for the minister to explain the reason the expenditure in this instance has been decreased. Referring more particularly to the province of New Brunswick I would say to the minister that with only \$350,000 for the maritime provinces generally I do not see how it is possible for the department to get along with that amount of money and at the same time do justice to the industries, especially the fishing industry, in the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick. At this time I intend to speak particularly of the province of New Brunswick; the representatives of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island may at a later