

was that personally I was very much inclined towards agreeing to the request made for expenditures in Toronto harbour and for the extension of postal facilities in that city. But it was then too late to give consideration to the recommendations because the supplementaries had been prepared. However, the door is not definitely closed—

Mr. MASSEY: The “revolving” door?

Mr. CARDIN: The open door. However, I feel that before the session closes there will be an opportunity of meeting, if not in their entirety, at least in part, the requests which have been made. The amount of expenditures provided for the city of Toronto is going to be somewhat larger than that provided in these estimates, which means that part of the recommendations made will probably be favourably considered if the hon. member can help me convince my colleague the Minister of Finance that we ought to do something more for Toronto. So, although I am making no promise, I am ready to shed a little ray of hope in the mind of the hon. member.

Mr. MASSEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my voice to that of the hon. member for Spadina in connection with this item. I fully realize that hon. members are at times apt to regard the city of Toronto as being somewhat ambitious for its own development. In speaking to this item to-night I am sure the hon. member for Spadina will support me when I urge upon the minister the need for this work, not only for the purpose to which the work is to be put, but also in view of the fact that within Toronto there is probably a larger number of unemployed than in any other urban area in Canada, with possibly one exception. Relief work has been and will be done. One is not anxious to develop improvements, or whatever we may wish to call them, solely through relief works.

The request which was made to the minister through the proper channels, a request which the minister states was made arduously, was for a very legitimate purpose. Those of us who are interested in the development not only of the harbour of Toronto but of Canadian harbours generally, feel very keenly that this work should be put forward. We notice that in estimate number 343 there are some substantial votes. One sees, for example, that the city of Port Arthur is to have harbour improvements costing \$260,000. Port Arthur, of course, has some very honourable sons, and is a splendid and important port in Canada. On the other hand, Toronto gets only \$125,000, or about half that of Port Arthur. If improve-

[Mr. Cardin.]

ments go forward in connection with transportation facilities—even though we have been relegated to the position of the end of a “feeder line” so far as air transportation is concerned—no doubt there will be an increase in traffic to and from Toronto and resulting in greater demand on the harbour.

Bearing in mind not only the necessity for this work from the point of view of Toronto's harbour development but also its importance from the point of view of providing work, I am sure that those of us who have at heart the interests of those whom we earnestly and sincerely attempt to represent in this house feel we would be derelict in our duty if we did not raise our voices at this time and earnestly urge the minister fully to take into consideration, and if at all possible, to follow to a conclusion, the perfectly legitimate requests which have been made, and to see that the full amount of \$400,000 be granted for the purpose for which it is asked.

Mr. LENNARD: I wish to direct the minister's attention to the item “Burlington channel, dredging” and “Burlington channel, reconstruction of south pier.” Are these re-votes?

Mr. CARDIN: The \$25,000 for dredging is a new expenditure, but there is a revote of \$35,000 out of \$108,000 provided for the construction of the south pier.

Mr. LENNARD: The minister will remember that when the reconstruction of this south pier was being considered last year, he said the work would be let by contract.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. LENNARD: I understand the work has since been changed to a cost-plus basis.

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. LENNARD: Who has the contract?

Mr. CARDIN: The Russell Construction Company Limited, of Toronto.

Mr. LENNARD: This work is still under contract?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. LENNARD: How many government inspectors are there on this job?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed by the deputy minister that usually there are two inspectors on jobs of this size, but I would not be too sure about this as I have not definite information before me.

Mr. LENNARD: When similar work was carried on at Burlington channel some years ago, the contractor continued working