

Mr. HARTIGAN: I should like to ask the minister if some of this money is to be spent on a port outside Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): No.

Mr. HARTIGAN: Is there any intention on the part of the department to equip an airport outside Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): No, except an airport in Newfoundland, in connection with radio and meteorological service. That was voted in the previous estimates.

Mr. HARTIGAN: That is what I had in mind. I am not a lawyer, but if anything is unconstitutional surely it is equipping an airport outside Canada, using Canadian money. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is not in this vote at all.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Other Projects—Harbours and Rivers—

Quebec

Amos—wharf extension, \$3,325.
 Anse à Beaufile—repairs to harbour works, \$15,000.
 Anse à Brillant—fishing harbour, \$45,000.
 Belœil—protection work, \$7,700.
 Black River—dredging—the provincial government to contribute a like amount, \$4,000.
 Bonaventure—protection work, \$9,000.
 Cap Chat—protection work, \$7,700.
 Chandler—wharf repairs, \$7,000.
 Cross Point—dredging, \$12,000.
 Etang du Nord, M.I.—harbour improvements, \$25,000.
 Granby—protection work, \$6,000.
 Gros Cap, M.I.—landing pier, \$3,100.
 Havre Aux Maisons, M.I.—wharf, \$6,500.
 Lac Duparquet—wharf, \$2,600.
 Lac Rouyn (Mercier)—wharf, \$2,300.
 Lanoraie—extension to protection wall, \$2,800.
 Laprairie—icebreakers, \$4,200.
 Laprairie—repairs to dyke, \$28,000.
 Lavaltrie—extension to protection wall, \$3,100.
 Levis—wharf, \$50,000.
 Malbaie—small landing pier, \$1,780.
 Matane—extension to east breakwater, \$60,000.
 Mont Louis—protection work, \$5,600.
 Moffette—wharf, \$3,500.
 Moisie—protection wall extension and repairs, \$2,500.
 New Richmond—protection work, \$7,000.
 Notre Dame de Pierreville—protection wall, \$16,000.
 Notre Dame de Pierreville (Chenal Tardif)—icebreaker, \$3,200.
 Notre Dame du Portage—wharf repairs, \$10,000.
 Paspébiac—wharf extension, \$46,000.
 Peninsula—wharf extension, \$2,600.
 Petite Rivière St. François—wharf extension, \$15,000.
 Petite Vallée—wharf extension, \$27,000.

Pointe Claire—completion of approach, \$2,000.
 Pointe du Lac—protection work, \$10,000.
 Pointe Jaune—improvements to fishing harbour, \$27,000.

Pointe St. Pierre—wharf reconstruction, \$12,500.

Richelieu river—improvement of river and Chambly canal system, \$500,000.

Rimouski—harbour improvements, \$150,000.

Rivière au Rats—wharf, \$4,900.

Rivière Beaudette—protection work, \$2,000.

Rivière Blondelle—protection work, \$5,200.

Rivière des Hurons—contribution towards dredging, the balance of cost to be borne by the province, \$75,000.

Ruisseau Pariseau—contribution towards dredging, the balance of cost to be borne by the province, \$15,000.

Ste. Anne des Monts (river)—extension of training pier, \$8,000.

St. Antoine de Tilly—wharf construction, \$17,000.

St. Etienne de Malbaie (Casgrain wharf)—fill spans, \$5,000.

St. Godroy (Rivière Nouvelle)—protection work, \$16,650.

St. Grégoire de Montmorency—repairs and completion of protection wall, \$5,000.

St. Maurice river—dredging, \$18,000.

St. Michel des Saints—extension to protection works, \$1,800.

St. Omer—raising protection work, \$4,400.

Ste. Rose—protection wall, \$4,900.

St. Simeon de Bonaventure—protection work, \$12,200.

Saguenay river—dredging, \$200,000.

Sorel—harbour improvements, \$85,000.

Tadoussac (Anse Tadoussac)—wharf improvements, \$15,000.

Val Barette—protection work, \$3,000.

Varenes—protection wall, \$15,000.

Verchères—protection wall, \$10,000.

Victoriaville—protection work, \$5,000.

To provide for payment of salaries and expenses in connection with the investigation in Canada of the improvement of the waterway from Montreal through lake Champlain to the Hudson river, \$20,000.

Mr. STEWART: In the past the practice has been to call each vote in these items, since they include long lists of public works. For some time we have discussed the one vote in connection with the work on the Richelieu river. When the matter was before the committee previously the minister made a statement which to some extent changes the nature of the expenditure. We started out with the assumption that the expenditure was in connection with the improvement of the Chambly canal and that it was but the beginning of an estimated or probable expenditure of \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000. Strong objection was taken from different sections of the house to a commitment of that kind at this time. I do not propose to enlarge upon that at all; it seems so self-evident, so apparent that we ought not to embark upon anything like that now, particularly in connection with a work the result of which very likely would not justify the expenditure of any such sum.