

present government came into office those public conveniences were in reasonably good repair, but at present they are in anything but good repair.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): My hon. friend again points out an opportunity for spending more money. There is no doubt that a number of these wharves do need expenditure; we have reports to that effect. But again I can only plead shortage of funds. When my hon. friend says he did not get any work done in his constituency I can only point out that he is in error, because during the last year in North Vancouver we carried out thirty-one works at an expenditure of \$14,369, one-sixth of the whole amount spent in British Columbia out of this vote.

Mr. MUNN: Perhaps I exaggerated a little, but I meant those I recommended direct. These others were taken care of, but there were several cases where repairs that I asked for were not taken care of. I realize that this is not a time to ask any government to spend money, but when you have a property that has cost money, that is a public convenience, an effort should be made to keep it in repair so that the public can make use of it.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, it is a striking tribute to the integrity and fairness of the minister that so many men among his political opponents have risen one after the other to speak of it. I do not think I ever saw that happen in this house before, and I am pleased to add my testimony to the same effect.

Now I will say a word or two about the appropriations. As the minister truly says, I suppose I am asking for more money to be spent. I understand the policy of the department is not to do any new work but to maintain the works that are already in existence. That certainly is all I ask, or that I think the hon. member for Vancouver North asks. The vote out of which these things comes will be the general vote of \$100,000; that is not enough. I suggest that it should be enlarged, not necessarily to spend it, but to have it in case it is necessary. I heard many comments in the early part of this session from the minister and from hon. members saying that an extraordinary storm which occurred last fall necessitated extra work which had not been foreseen. I have lived forty years in British Columbia and I never saw a winter yet that there was not an extra storm at some period, an abnormal and unusual one; it always happens, and it ought to be provided for. I have before me the estimates prepared by the minister's own engineers in British Columbia as to what they

thought was necessary for the even bare upkeep of these public works in my district. It totals \$40,000, and out of that there is one item in these estimates for Comox of \$11,000. But the other items are just as urgent and necessary. It is not my suggestion alone that we need \$40,000; it is that of the minister's own engineers. I would not ask and I am not asking for a penny to be spent unless on the O. K. of his engineers. In fact I think in the case of two works it is not necessary to spend what the engineer recommended, because I thought he had been got at politically and had recommended something that was not called for. At any rate this \$40,000 has the endorsement of his own practical, experienced engineers. I will not read all the details, as some of the hon. members for Quebec did; I could go on for an hour giving names and explanations, but they would be only names to the minister and I would be wasting the time of the committee. His deputies and engineers are acquainted with these works; they know what is necessary and I do not think they would ever say that every item is not required.

One hon. member said the coast line in his constituency was some 780 miles in length, and he seemed to think that was something unique. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have one fford in my district that is almost equal to that. I never took the trouble or went to the expense of figuring out what would be the total coast line, but certainly it would run to almost six or seven thousand miles if all the indentations were measured. The two engineers recommended an expenditure of \$40,000 for works now in existence, with no provision for emergencies, which are bound to develop due to storms and other factors. That sum is forty per cent of \$100,000, the entire vote, and certainly you could add another \$10,000 for emergencies. There you have half the vote for the whole province of British Columbia recommended by the engineers for Comox Alberni. There are three other districts, making four in all, which will require the expenditure of money in this connection, and I suppose the Skeena district would require an even greater expenditure than my district, while some of the others perhaps would require a little less. Also there are several lake wharves in the interior which must be looked after out of this vote, and we find one district out of four requiring one-half the total vote. That is why I suggest that there is not enough money being voted.

Now just a word with regard to the general principle. There are three reasons why these works should be maintained as we go along,