

and the first reason is that it would be cheaper in the long run. I think somewhere in the scriptures you will find this quotation:

There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty.

That is the situation; it does not pay to be penny wise and pound foolish. I have some recollection of a wharf approach, a float, which was broken during a storm. Only \$10 or \$12 would have been required to repair that approach at the time, but before they got around to it the constant dragging of the broken portion of the float necessitated an expenditure of something over \$100. This is just an illustration; it could be duplicated in scores of cases. It pays to keep your house, your car, your wharf or anything else in good repair; it does not pay to let it go down, because you must repair it in the long run, when it costs more.

The second reason is that it is not fair to the settlers. These men have been encouraged to go and have gone in there, and for twenty years their only means of access has been by water. It is not a case of driving or walking over a road as compared with going by water; it is their only way of obtaining supplies. The steamers, which are getting larger all the time with the increased traffic, will not stop at these wharves if they are not safe; they are afraid of accidents. They simply refuse to call; whether or not the settlers must go ten or fifteen miles in an open row boat, they will not call until repairs are made. Of course that is not fair to the settlers.

The third reason is that it is economically unsound, because the life of these works is very short. An uncreosoted pile or log has a very short life. I suppose the minister's engineers would know exactly, but I should say they would not last more than four years at the most. I know of a float that was put in during the month of August; the very best cedar logs and so on were used, but it was so ravaged by teredos that it had to be renewed the following September—just thirteen months afterwards. That is an illustration of the short life of these works. Of course when the piles are creosoted they last much longer, perhaps for fifteen or eighteen years if nothing happens in the meantime. When you take a work whose life is only four years and leave it out of commission for six or nine months it certainly makes your work very costly for the short time it is in operation.

Therefore I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they should be repaired; I believe it would pay the government to keep them in good order. I think it is the best policy in the [Mr. Neill.]

long run, and it is only a question of voting the money a little sooner. I do suggest to the minister that \$100,000 is insufficient to carry on the work in British Columbia. It does not make a great deal of difference, it seems to me, whether we vote \$100,000 this year and \$200,000 next year or \$150,000 this year, and the same sum next year; it would be cheaper if we did so. I am fully seized of the need for economy, but as I said before sometimes it is the best policy to spend wisely. I hope the minister will bear that in mind when he is preparing the supplementary estimates.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): I wonder if the minister could tell me what part of the vote was spent in the riding of Skeena last year, and where it was spent.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Eight works were given attention in the constituency of Skeena, at a cost of \$3,239.82.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Would the minister tell me where those works were located?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The list I have gives the work done in all ridings. I can find those in Skeena, but it will take a little time.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Perhaps the minister could let me have it later.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I will try to give it to the hon. member now. I see Port Clements, \$914.44; Port Essington, \$95.54; Prince Rupert, \$15.06, lighting for float; Queen Charlotte City, \$18; Sandspit, \$1,088.25, and Stewart, wharf repairs, \$50.04. I believe that is all.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Is it the intention of the department to carry on the work indicated by the items in vote 121?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): We have not yet allocated this vote or determined on how it will be spent. I gave the expenditures made last year. We do not know where we will spend the money this year, but it will be spent where it is needed most.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): But will those undertakings set out in vote 121 be proceeded with?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I misunderstood my hon. friend. It is our present intention to proceed with those special items, though we do not know what the future may bring.

Mr. MUNN: I should like to appeal to my hon. friend on behalf of the people at Robert's Creek, in connection with which I wrote the minister a few days ago. This is