

policy with regard to them, that would be applicable to the whole country. But when he says he does not know what the income will be because it has not been transferred, that seems to me to be an excuse for the time being to get the item passed.

Grande Rivière (Gaspé)—repairs to wharf and approach, \$5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The proposed extension will be 100 feet long, and the probable cost will be \$15,500. Repairs to the approach, \$500. We expended in 1908-9, \$7,772.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long will it be before the work is completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to have it completed during the coming fiscal year. The extension is cribwork filled with stone, 37 feet in width at one end, and 40 feet at the other. We are extending it 100 feet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was built 25 years ago. I think there was at the outer end of the wharf something like 20 feet of water. But the Grand river empties nearby, and carries down sand, and for a few years back there has been an accumulation of sand which, on several occasions, prevented ships from reaching the wharf. There are three steamers using this wharf, one running between Montreal and Gaspé, one from Campbellton to Gaspé, and, I think, another one running between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé ports. This is a very important place. On two or three occasions last summer a steamer was stopped on its way on account of the accumulation of sand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate of the engineer is that this sum will complete the work. We have already expended \$7,772, and this \$5,000 will make \$12,000. That will leave \$2,500 more that we will have to get later on.

Mr. SPROULE. That is done by contract, I presume?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far the work we have done in the way of repairs has been by day labour, but we have not decided as to whether we shall ask for a contract for this. I think that in all probability we shall.

Mr. SPROULE. But you say you have spent \$7,000 on the new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did I say on the new work?

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if it was on the new work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My notes do not distinguish clearly between new work and repairs. The only note which I have is that this \$5,000 is to make provision for repairs to the wharf and roadway of approach and extending the wharf at Grand Rivière. The total cost is estimated to be \$15,000. Then

Mr. SPROULE.

we deduct from that the expenditure during 1908-9, which work was done by day work. There is an appropriation for the year which will expire on March 31 next of \$5,000. I have not a memo of how much of that has been expended.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it done by day work or contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whatever has been expended has been by day work. Then we have the additional \$5,000 which we are now asking, and we will require \$2,500 more to finish the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that you propose to do that by day work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided, but I do not see why we should not do that by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see why the other should not have been done by contract, if you pay any attention to the resolution to this House, that all work involving an expenditure of \$5,000 or over shall be done by contract unless the circumstances are exceptional.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to that, I shall confer with the chief engineer, but I think it could be very well done by contract.

Grande Vallée—restoration of breakwater pier—revote of \$9,850 lapsed, \$10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That \$9,850 was voted for the year which ended on the 31st March, 1909, and it was not used. We are asking for an extension of the same amount. This is to make provision towards repairing the pier at Grande Vallée. There are quite a large number of mills at that place, and the wharf is badly in need of repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. Is \$10,000 the total amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will require to spend the \$10,000, but the estimate is that \$4,500 more will be required to finish it.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid this will have to be done by day work, as it is repairing and it is very difficult to let a contract for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the total cost of this pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure up to the 31st December, 1909, was \$57,773.85.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is not the pier that is built in front of or on private property that we heard of some years ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not think so. My hon. friend may possibly have the same work in his mind, but the government owns the site. It is built on government property.