tion to the system already there. He mentioned the system would be turned over to a private agency for operation. Are we bringing it up to a particular standard before it is turned over, or what is the significance of this item?

Mr. McIlraith: I have quite a lengthy explanation here, but I shall summarize it. It is an attempt to recognize the fact that the public works department is taking over responsibility for the administration of this area. It is a transfer of an item that used to be under national harbours board. It is really a transfer rather than an expenditure.

Mr. Peters: Is this the item that is going to be turned over to a private company for operation?

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Aiken: Under vote 30d there is an item for a total cost of \$30,000. Previously the figure that had to be listed in the estimates was \$25,000 or more, and I am wondering if there has been a change of policy in this regard?

Mr. McIlraith: I believe there is no change.

Mr. Chatterion: When the Minister of Public Works was dealing with his estimates he announced the establishment of a new policy with regard to marinas, to encourage tourists. I am bringing this to the attention of the government, and since the minister announced such a policy it is time we received some further information about the policy. We look forward early in the new session to some elaboration of this promise made by the minister last May.

Mr. Nasserden: In so far as engineering services are concerned, I should like to mention a request made by the Hudson bay route association, for a study of the feasibility of a breakwater at the mouth of the river at Churchill.

Mr. Pickersgill: That would not be public works.

Mr. Nasserden: It occurs to me that the item covers harbours and rivers, and this is another harbour and another river.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think Churchill is a harbour under the national harbours board.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): There is an item for \$5,000 for Little River, Victoria, Nova Scotia. I understand the contract was awarded some time ago. Is this just additional money?

Supply-Public Works

Mr. McIlraith: It is a matter of identifying the item. The detail is not shown in the main estimates.

Mr. Peters: Is there an item in this vote to cover the request of the Georgian bay tourist association, that the committee recommended after discussing the water levels on the great lakes?

Mr. McIlraith: There is nothing in these supplementaries for that.

Mr. Aiken: Ever since this question of water levels on the great lakes came up, the government has promised it would make extra efforts toward dredging, particularly in Georgian bay, for those people who have lost contact with the present water levels. I regret the absence of any item here for dredging. It certainly does not indicate any great urgency on the part of the government to remedy the situation.

Item agreed to.

National capital commission-

60d. Operation and maintenance, general administration and interest charges on outstanding loans that were made for the purpose of acquiring property in the national eapital region, \$318,000.

Mr. Peters: Does this include any appropriation for acquiring the property known as the union station?

Mr. McIlraith: No, there appears to be nothing in this vote for that.

Canadian corporation for the 1967 world exhibition—

70d. Toward federal share of the cost of construction of an ice control structure, \$1,825,000.

Mr. Howard: A limit of \$20 million was established as the amount to be spent from the federal treasury under the act setting up the Canadian corporation. Is this sum of \$1,825,000, and the sum of \$150,000 in the next vote, within the confines set out in the act?

Mr. Pickersgill: The first is for the structure that had to be constructed to protect Montreal harbour from the ice coming down in spring. It is right by the Champlain bridge.

Mr. Howard: That may be what it is for, but is it an expenditure within the \$20 million limit set out in the act?

Mr. McIlraith: It is a separate item.

Mr. Howard: Then I intend to register my voice against it, because parliament was told it would only cost the taxpayers up to the amount of \$20 million. I do not want to raise