

public buildings or harbour work on the ground that these were simply thrown out as a bait to capture constituencies. But if that was their cry in the past, what can they say of the present instance, where upwards of a quarter of a million dollars is to be expended in a single harbour, when, almost within shouting distance, is another harbour where hardly a single dollar is required to be expended. If it is the policy of the Government to place this large contract, I think it is only fair that the House should know what is the amount of the contemplated expenditure. The sum in the Estimates is \$80,000. The Minister, I think, will frankly admit that that is hardly half, perhaps not even one-third, of the contemplated expenditure. If the hon. Minister intends to undertake the work of deepening the harbour of Collingwood to the depth to which it should be deepened in order to accommodate the traffic of the upper lakes, I am informed the expenditure will considerably exceed a quarter of a million dollars. And while the Minister is generous in expending this large sum in one harbour, I trust that, though I have the honour to oppose the Government, he will extend his consideration to a harbour that requires only a trifling grant. The Minister was pleased to send a dredge to Midland to do some trifling work; but no sooner had that dredge got into the harbour and done one or two days' work, than, to our great amazement, it was ordered to leave the port and abandon the work which it had commenced. I think it is only fair to every constituency that, where public interest demands it, there should be a fair expenditure of money; and I am going to protest against the Minister fighting the town of Collingwood with a quarter of a million dollars against a town that requires but \$1,000, on the ground that it is not fair-play. If the Minister is going to act upon it as a principle that any constituency which may be pleased, as it has the right to do, to oppose this Government, is to be sat upon, then that fact had better at once be known. Now, as I said at the outset, I am not speaking to enter a protest against this large expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars in the town of Collingwood. But I rise to ask the Minister to give the committee information as to the extent of the estimated expenditure in Collingwood harbour, and furthermore, what will be the depth of the water to be attained at that port, when this work is completed. We should be told, also, whether the appropriation asked now is part of the total contract and if the contract when completed will give the harbour of Collingwood a depth of water that will accommodate the tonnage of the great lakes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to give my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) the information he seeks. We have entered into a contract with Messrs. Boon & Armstrong for a total amount of \$144,000. The

Mr. BENNETT.

work consists of dredging a channel 4,000 feet long, 2,000 feet in what I may call the outside harbour to be dredged to 20 feet, and 2,000 feet in the inside harbour to be dredged to 18 feet. I ask for the sum of \$80,000 this year, because that will be quite sufficient to pay for the operations of the present season. My engineers report to me that the completion of this contract will be quite sufficient to give to the harbour of Collingwood all the accommodation that it would require. Now, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is not altogether fair in his readiness to reproach me with being a partisan. Not very long ago the hon. gentleman called at my department and I frankly told him that in a few days a dredge would be working at Midland. I will repeat what I have already said in this House, that whenever it is reported to me, or whenever I find out that a work is necessary in the county which is not represented by a friend of the Government, that will make no difference.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the width of the trench that is to be 2,000 feet long?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will vary somewhat, but the average width will be 450 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not find fault with the promise of the hon. Minister that a dredge would be placed in Midland to do some work this summer. All I can say is that the dredge is not there yet, and what I did refer to is the fact that though the Minister last year gave me his word that certain work would be done at the town of Midland, no sooner was the dredge there and perhaps two days' work done, than, for reasons best known to himself, for reasons he has always been afraid to state to the House, the dredge was sent out of the harbour. I allege that this was done through political influence, and I have every reason to believe that the Minister acted on that occasion on political considerations. I trust that as an earnest that he has dismissed the idea of carrying out such a policy in the future, he will have the dredge in Midland this summer and do the trifling work that requires to be done there. The Minister has stated that the work would cost \$144,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the amount of the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. At the same time he tells us the nature of the work, I must confess that I regret to see that there should be such an immense amount of public money expended on what must seem to every hon. gentleman, if he realizes what is being done, a work of most trifling nature. The hon. Minister proposes to dredge a channel to a depth of 20 feet, 2,000 feet in length and about 150 yards in width. The Minister and the House must see that the Government are spending about \$150,000 to dig a trench to permit vessels to be towed in, because it is utterly impossible for sailing