

Vancouver know that money can be advantageously spent there in the development of one of our basic industries. I contrast the "economy" of the government in this instance with the \$12,000,000 voted during the past week, in most cases, to be spent on proposals which have not the redeeming feature of being necessary to take care of the actual business necessities of to-day.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In reply to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) regarding increased shipping facilities on the Fraser river, undoubtedly there has been a tremendous increase in the shipping of lumber and its products and also of some of the mineral products of the province. As to voting some millions of dollars and doing the job in one contract, my hon. friend cannot have given the problem that consideration which it demands. The trouble would not be cured except by the expenditure of a tremendous sum of money, and even then we might not be successful. I think the method adopted by the department is the proper one, that of training the river, as it were, and in that way securing a clear channel. I do not think my hon. friend can complain, because the history of the river for the last two or three years has been more or less satisfactory. At times our friends have been uneasy and somewhat nervous, but generally speaking the trouble has been pretty well taken care of.

In regard to the north arm, my hon. friend from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) has dilated upon the advantages of that channel, and unquestionably there are many industries situated along it. But to suggest that the government of Canada has neglected the channel would hardly be in accordance with the facts. Since 1911 about \$2,000,000 has been expended on the north arm in retaining walls, dredging and so forth; during 1922-23 we spent \$23,605, and during 1923-24, \$55,920. These later expenditures were for dredging to keep the channel open. The breakwater that my hon. friend refers to is a very large undertaking. Some years ago the government extended the wall out some distance from the mouth of the north arm. It is proposed to carry this out further to deep water, but that work requires a very large sum of money, and up to the present the money has not been available.

Mr. LADNER: On that point, with the original investment there now and the work partly completed, would it not be better business to keep step with the increase of industry there instead of remaining idle?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend must realize that with the necessity for economy what he suggests has not been possible.

Mr. LADNER: Why has that economy not been practised in Quebec harbour and other places?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it has been. Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, \$65,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does this item include repairs to the wharf at White Rock? I think representations have been made to the minister as to the dangerous condition of that wharf.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I notice that last year under the general item of harbours and rivers, \$163.25 was expended at White Rock. I expect that was for urgent repairs.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But I mean for the current year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have a list before me of forty places, but I do not see White Rock included.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I draw the attention of the minister to the necessity for repairs at this wharf. I presume he has a report from his resident engineer that the wharf is in need of repairs. I am told it is so bad now that it is really dangerous for anyone to use it, and yet the life belts have been removed. Representations have been made by the rate-payers' association and other bodies in White Rock asking for the replacement of these life belts, but I understand the resident engineer said that this could not be done as the vote had been exhausted. It seems to me it is running things pretty fine when such an excuse has to be given. The minister knows this wharf is very extensively used, and he may be certain that if it is dangerous, something will happen one of these days for which he will be sorry.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will have the matter looked into.

Item agreed to.

Mayne island—wharf repairs and improvements, \$4,200.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the improvements?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Renewing the superstructure of the wharf-head and approach, renewal of fender piles, also a new float 16 x 30 feet, making a total expenditure of \$4,200.