

*Supply—Public Works*

deal of work. If such is the case I may say that I want to keep the work to a minimum. I have no desire to call on his department for reports which are unreasonably long; but I would ask that the list he gives us be divided into those three categories set out by the section.

Finally there is one local matter that I should like to place before the minister. As he knows, last year we urged upon him that dredging work should be undertaken in the first narrows of Vancouver harbour just as quickly as possible. In February of this year it was announced in the house that that work would be done, and I understood that it would be commenced at once; but in the estimates as tabled I find nothing for the present fiscal year to cover that work. I do not believe that any work has actually been undertaken in the first narrows.

I would point out to the minister that there is great urgency about this matter. We are being told by some of the oil companies—I heard the president of one of them intimate as much in addressing the Canadian Club here last week—that because Vancouver harbour needs improvement they are therefore going to pipe some of the oil from Alberta down across the boundary. I think that is just used as an argument. I do not think there are any tankers off the coast at the moment that are so big that they cannot use the harbour. But this argument is being advanced by some of the oil companies in support of their plan to send Alberta oil down into the state of Washington.

Then there is the great importance of not giving Vancouver harbour a bad reputation. It is one of the great harbours of the world. I do not believe there is in Canada a finer harbour than that of Vancouver. Simply because there is a need for further dredging to a depth of four feet or five feet, we do not want to have our harbour's reputation ruined by delay in getting this work undertaken. Both the ministers from British Columbia have given their word in Vancouver that that work would go ahead at once. I hope it is started, but so far as I know it is not. I would ask the minister to make that position clear when he speaks tonight.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** Briefly may I go over the points mentioned by the hon. gentleman. The first problem was construction works by other departments. As to that, the system is as follows. In every department they need certain specialized kinds of buildings. For instance, in the Department of National Health and Welfare they are in the hospital business. They have a few architects to design plans and give their ideas as to the hospitals they want to put up. This would

be in the Indian branch of that department. Those architects co-operate and give some information to the architects of the Department of Public Works. They get the vote for the building and we do the work.

There are only a few departments where we do not do the work. For instance, we do not do their work for the Department of National Defence on the operation side; they have all that work done themselves or by Defence Construction Limited which is, we hope, a temporary arrangement. The Department of Transport generally do their own work on their airports and their facilities. But in nearly every other department—take, for instance, the mounted police—they have their vote of money but we generally do the work. That applies to nearly every department. So there is no taking away from the Department of Public Works of something that we have. We are extremely jealous of the work that is under our jurisdiction, but we are only the servants of these people in the other departments and we try to cater to their needs and supply their wants.

I do not say that in the other place they made a mistake, but I myself do not like to see any other department infringing on or duplicating the services that we are prepared to render to all departments and to the people. That would be the explanation I would give for these amounts which my hon. friend sees in the votes and in that white paper which is annexed to the estimates.

As to the increase in the estimates, may I say this. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) is quite an experienced parliamentarian. If he looks in this blue book that I have—I have not got the other one—

**Mr. Green:** That is the blue book I have not got.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** No, but you have this blue book. They have prepared this big blue book of estimates so that I may have less trouble in explaining what I want to say. If my hon. friend will look in that blue book he will see where the increases take place as between the two years. That is to be found at pages 50, 51 and 52. They are detailed there. My hon. friend will see that the difference between the estimates is about \$5,765,000; and if he will read down those columns headed "Increase" and "Decrease", he will have the whole explanation. I could go over the items with him, but I think it would save time if he would just read those two columns. Then he will probably know as much as I do about those increases.

**Mr. Green:** I wanted an explanation as to the main increases.