

work done for the past four or five years is on repairing the existing breakwater. Some twelve years ago about 250 feet of this breakwater was swept into the ocean and what remained was considerably damaged. For the past two years the department has been repairing the existing breakwater and making it somewhat of a permanent character in cement and stone. The 250 feet which was destroyed has not been reconstructed, and it is necessary that it should be in order to make the harbour a proper one. I would suggest that when the present repairs to the part of the pier remaining are completed, the work of constructing the new portion should be done by tender and contract. I would impress on the minister that this is a very important matter, and I hope he will see his way clear at an early date to proceed with the work of reconstructing the portion of the pier destroyed. That, in my judgment, should be done by tender and contract.

Mr. AMES. The minister stated last year the total estimated cost of this work was \$200,000. How much of that is for repairs and how much for new work?

Mr. FISHER. That estimate was for the whole of the new work, should it be carried out.

Mr. AMES. Is it not possible that this new work should be done by tender and contract?

Mr. FISHER. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. AMES. Is it the intention of the government to have the new work done by contract?

Mr. FISHER. This vote is for repairs simply.

Mr. AMES. This \$10,000 is to be used entirely for repairs?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the vote says 'repairs to breakwater.'

Culloden breakwater, \$6,500.

Mr. GANONG. In what county is this?

Mr. FISHER. Digby.

Mr. GANONG. When was the first vote made for this work?

Mr. FISHER. The arrangement for the contract was made last year and if a vote had been taken earlier it is probable that a contract would have been let before that.

Mr. GANONG. Is the property owned by the government?

Mr. FISHER. It is a breakwater out in the sea, and we control all water within three miles of our shores.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

Mr. GANONG. Do we own the landing to the breakwater?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. What is the estimated cost of the total work?

Mr. FISHER. \$6,500. The contract is let for \$5,850 and the superintendence and contingencies are estimated at \$650.

Mr. GANONG. What population is there at Culloden?

Mr. FISHER. There is a statement here that this is situated seven miles north of Digby town and that a number of families partly engaged in farming and partly in fishing are resident there; this is to give protection to their fishing boats.

Mr. GANONG. What protection are you giving to the farmers?

Mr. FISHER. We help them in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GANONG. According to 'Hansard' the minister stated formerly that this would cost \$20,000.

Mr. FISHER. I think that must be a mistake. There is a statement here which calls attention to the fact that the people have subscribed \$2,000 in labour and \$700 in timber towards this work.

Mr. GANONG. The \$20,000 in 'Hansard' may be a misprint for \$2,000.

Digby harbour—improvements, including repairs to pier, \$2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I want some explanation of this.

Mr. FISHER. This is for repairs to the old wharf.

Mr. FOWLER. In 1906-7 \$12,000 was voted.

Mr. FISHER. \$10,000 is spent and \$2,000 revoted.

Mr. FOWLER. Was that \$10,000 to carry out the contract that was made between the member for Digby (Mr. Copp) and the town?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister will remember that contract?

Mr. FISHER. I do not. I remember some talk about it.

Mr. FOWLER. The member for Digby was to receive \$5,000 if he got Digby made a winter port.

Mr. FISHER. I have not charged my memory with it.

Mr. FOWLER. The member for Digby is not here.