

and wharves which the Chief Engineer thought might be accepted. Then it is defined by Order in Council how many we have accepted; and, therefore, by comparing these statements, the hon. gentleman can obtain the information desired. I could give the names of the piers, but they would be of interest to only a few members. I may state that the total value is \$53,222; the tolls collected from 1st February, 1873, to 1st January, 1883, eleven years, amounted to \$6,096. The cost of the repairs will this year reach about \$12,000, because these piers have not been kept up as they would have been kept up if the Local Government had not been satisfied we would accept them. They were somewhat neglected during the last twelve months as regards repairs.

Mr. DAVIES. They were totally neglected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They were not kept up as usual, because the Local Government thought, no doubt, we would assume them. Under those circumstances, \$11,000 or \$12,000 will be required this year to place them in good repair. The ordinary repairs will amount to between \$3,000 and \$4,000 yearly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has failed, however, to state the principle on which this transaction is based—why it is applicable to Prince Edward Island and not to the other Provinces.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, there was no selection of piers made, and they were left in the hands of the Local Government. We took over only three or four, and the Local Government have repeatedly called the attention of the Federal Government to the fact that the piers in the Island should be maintained in the same way as the piers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Our difficulty was to know which piers should be placed on the same footing as those kept up by the Dominion Government in other Provinces, and we had to make a thorough investigation, which resulted as I have stated.

Mr. DAVIES. I have examined the papers very carefully and I have failed to find that any principle has been adopted, or adhered to, in the selection of the piers and wharves. I do not think the management of the business reflects very much credit on those who had charge of it—I say this with due respect to the Minister—either as representing this Government or the Local Government. The application was made before the Session of the House last year. A deputation of the Local Government came here last year; brought all the information, and pressed the matter on the Dominion Government, telling them that they, the Local Government, would not assume the repairs of the piers during the then ensuing year, and if something were not done, the piers would go to wreck. The Local Government made no provision for repairs. The hon. Minister of Public Works did not determine whether the Dominion Government would maintain the piers, or any of them, and consequently, during last year, the piers and wharves were allowed to go to wreck, and thousands of dollars were absolutely lost to the tax payers, because some decision was not arrived at on this question. During the summer of last year wharves were falling to ruin, and one was almost floating away, because they were not looked after. The two Governments acted like children in this matter. Not one dollar was expended by either of the Governments, and the consequence was that a great many thousand dollars will have to be expended to place the piers and wharves in the condition in which they might have been kept by the expenditure of a few hundreds. Leaving that point, I fail to see that the hon. gentleman has adopted any sound principle in the acceptance or rejection of these piers. The Local Government claimed that the Dominion Government should accept 82, on which there had been expended since 1873, \$145,283. They claimed that the money which they

had expended on the piers, which now belong to the Dominion Government, should be returned to them. The hon. gentleman did not allow that claim. He sent down inspectors, which was no doubt very proper for him to do, before arriving at a conclusion. He has accepted, on the report of the Chief Engineer, 25 piers. On what principle has he acted? The hon. gentleman or the Chief Engineer has accepted all the piers likely to pay any money, and the piers which are commercially failures are thrown on the hands of the Local Government. The hon. gentleman smiles, but the taxpayers of the Island do not smile. The hon. gentleman, I say, has taken those from which any revenue is obtained and thrown on the Local Government the balance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is not fair. I stated we had assumed 26 piers. The hon. gentleman says we have assumed all the good piers which will furnish any good revenue. The hon. gentleman will see what revenue may be expected from the 26 piers, from my statement that the revenue for the last eleven years was \$6,096.

Mr. DAVIES. What has been the revenue from those you have rejected? On what principle have you acted? These piers either belong to the Dominion Government or they do not. If they belong to the Dominion, you have a right to accept them; if they do not, you have no right. The hon. gentleman has not acted on that principle, but he has selected those which furnish most tolls and rejected those which do not pay well. And if I had time to do it I could show the hon. gentleman that the engineer has not proceeded on any principle. I assume that in accepting certain piers and leaving others to the Provincial Government, the hon. gentleman has been acting upon his construction of the British North America Act, which shows in the third schedule what works of this character belong to the Dominion. I say I suppose that is the principle upon which the hon. gentleman acted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. Then on what principle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has stated that we did not accept them on any principle, and now it will be for him to show on what principle we should have acted.

Mr. DAVIES. Attached to the Engineer's report, there is a statement showing the names of the piers, and the amount of money expended on each since Confederation, the amount received in tolls, and the explanation of the grounds on which they are received or rejected. In one case, I find that a wharf is rejected because it is said, owing to the existence of a railway wharf in the vicinity, there is no necessity for assuming it. Now, Sir, this is not a question of whether the work is a necessity or not. It is surely not to be left to the discretion of a Chief Engineer to declare whether or not certain works shall pass to the Dominion Government under the British North America Act. The next one I can understand, as it is reported to be for local purposes only. The next is not recommended as Dominion property, as the Engineer states the traffic is nil. Now, Sir, I say that they do not become Federal property or Provincial property accordingly as the traffic is large or small; that is a question to be decided by the terms of the Act. In another case the Engineer says the revenue was not very large, and therefore he recommends that it be thrown upon the Local Government. I say the hon. gentleman is not acting on a fair principle, for the returns show that he accepts or rejects these works accordingly as the returns are large or small. Under these circumstances I would ask the hon. gentleman if the Federal Government did or did not take charge of these works, under the third schedule