

Mr. KYTE: We are discussing this one. I would like the minister to read the report recommending the construction of this wharf.

Mr. REID: District Engineer Bernasconi, in his report of March 20, 1915, says:

There are at present seven public wharves on the shores of East Bay, fairly well distributed, with the exception of the shore between Big Pond and the head of East Bay, a distance of 12 miles. The proposed wharf at Ben Eoin would be about midway between these points and would fill the gap and give the required accommodation to the inhabitants of that section of the district. The site for the proposed wharf is owned by Mr. Joseph McLellan, who offers to sell the land required for the sum of \$10, which price I consider fair and just.

That is the official information.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister explain why it is that, report having been received in 1915, no appropriation has been placed in the estimates until now?

Mr. REID: I cannot explain that. The estimates, of course, were made out by the Minister of Public Works. These are the explanations furnished by the department, and I cannot give any others.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister think there is more money with which to build wharves this year than there was in 1914?

Mr. REID: I am not doing any thinking on this; it is an estimate of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. KYTE: If the minister is not doing any thinking, it would be a good idea for him to do some.

Mr. REID: I am satisfied that the Minister of Public Works would not insert this item unless he thought it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. KYTE: For election purposes.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. KYTE: The report says that there are seven wharves already in East Bay, but inasmuch as there is a distance of 12 miles between two wharves, it is important that this wharf should be built. I very much regret that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) is not here. He might perhaps produce the plan which he laid upon the table of this House in 1910 or 1911, and on which he had marked out the number of wharves in the Maritime Provinces built by the late Government, as he said, without any justification. This is another case in which the Government appear to have gone back

on whatever record they made, when they were in Opposition, with respect to the expenditure of money upon wharves. I am as much interested in the convenience of the people of my district as the acting Minister of Public Works can possibly be, but the people of my district realize the necessity for economy on the part of the Government, and I beg to assure the minister that they understand why this estimate is brought before Parliament at the present time. A request was made three years ago for the building of a wharf at that point. That request was not complied with. Year after year went by; estimates were voted by Parliament, but no provision was made for the building of this wharf until the year 1917. If this item had been placed in the main estimates for 1917-18, the Government might still be entitled to some credit for discharging a public duty; but inasmuch as provision for the building of this wharf is made only in the supplementary estimates, which came down after it was determined by the Government that there should be an election, we can all realize the motive that actuated the minister. If there ever were a time when provision for expenditure on new work ought not to be made, it certainly ought to be now, and I would suggest—and I take all responsibility necessary for making this suggestion—that the minister drop this item out of the estimates.

Mr. CARROLL: I know something about the location of this wharf, and the engineer who reported to the minister that there were seven wharves in East Bay must have been seeing seven times as many wharves as he should have seen. There are not seven wharves in East Bay. Three years ago I forwarded a petition from the people at the head of East Bay to this Government asking for repairs to a wharf which has been of considerable service to the inhabitants of that place, and which is quite near East Bay church in the vicinity of which the larger proportion of the people live. The Department of Public Works paid no attention to the matter, and, as a result, that wharf is absolutely useless and worthless to the people of that section. Has the minister any plan showing how the people who would be served by this proposed wharf are going to get to the main road? It is about two and one-half miles from the main road, and there is absolutely no communication. If the minister wishes to have a wharf which will be of service to the people, he should repair that wharf which has been