

will be pleased. It is not customary to place in the main Estimates votes for works which are not initiated. The main Estimates contain only votes for works which have been begun, and that is the reason why many works which will find a place in the Supplementary Estimates are not mentioned here. My hon. friend is not just when he says that counties represented by opponents of the Government do not receive a fair share of public expenditure. If he will kindly look at these Estimates, he will find that in one case \$500 is going to be voted, that \$17,500 is voted for the Souris breakwater, and that \$12,000 is to be voted for Margaretville pier. When I have to ask this Parliament for money I do not consider whether it is going to be voted for a Liberal county or a Conservative county; it would not be fair to do so. In that respect I quite agree with my hon. friend, and when the Supplementary Estimates come down he will find that the rule he advocates will have received application.

Mr. GILLIES. I am very much obliged to the hon. Minister of Public Works for the kind manner in which he is disposed to look upon the work to which I have drawn his attention; but this is a work that was long ago initiated, and that is why I draw his attention to it on these main Estimates. The plan was made by his own engineer nearly three years ago, and it is now in his department. I am also pleased to know that he is in line with me when I say that it would be a very improper way to distribute public money by signaling one county favourably when it had a representative here supporting the Government, and discriminating against one represented by an opponent of the Government, and that he is likely to be actuated by that view of the matter.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if anything has been done in connection with a work to which his attention was called last session by my colleague, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who urged the necessity of a wharf or some other protection for fishing boats at Cape John in that county. While on my feet, I will mention another matter. I was informed by residents of Merigomish, in the county of Pictou, that they had sent a petition to the Minister asking for some grant to extend and strengthen the wharf at that point. They did not use me as a medium, and it is possible that this may be provided for in the vote I see lower down for general repairs and improvements of harbours in maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will look into the facts, as I do not remember now whether we received a petition or not.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. member for Richmond has referred to me

as having been returned by accident. If he will look back to the record he will find that I was elected twelve times the majority which returned him.

Mr. GILLIES. I never mentioned the hon. member for Inverness. In fact I had not the hon. gentleman in my mind at all. I would be delighted to see every grant possible made to the county of Inverness. He is entirely mistaken in the impression that I referred to him as being here by accident, and I should be delighted to see any grant the hon. gentleman applied for, now or in any other session, for Inverness, put in the Estimates.

Prince Edward Island—Souris—Reconstruction of breakwaters at Knight's Point \$17,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The expenditure up to date on that work has been very large. It has amounted to \$171,000. For this year we badly want the sum asked for. A part of the work is under contract and another part is being done by day's work. The amount of the contract is \$27,000.

Mr. FISHER. Last year the hon. gentleman got \$37,500. There is a re-vote of \$10,000 which leaves \$27,500, and this year he is asking for \$7,500. He is thus asking for \$35,000, and the contract is for \$27,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance will be employed in completing by day's work that part of the work which is not given under contract—the part inside the breakwater which could not be properly given by contract.

West Point wharf, Prince Edward Island.. \$6,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied to replace the wharf which was carried away during a gale in 1891. The total cost will be \$9,000.

Mr. PERRY. This was a wharf built by the local government of Prince Edward Island some years ago. In 1882 it was handed over to the Dominion Government. It had cost the local government \$5,000 or \$6,000, but the Dominion Government paid the local government \$7,000 for it. Since then the Dominion Government never saw fit to spend a dollar on it just because the county was represented by myself, and the result of this neglect was that the wharf was carried away. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has thrown out the insinuation against the Minister of Public Works that he is partial and has not treated the county of Richmond properly because it is represented by a Conservative. Well, for the last fifteen years the late Government never spent a dollar on the wharf at West Point. How much money did they spend on the Tignish breakwater? Why, Sir, since 1878 they have not spent \$1,-