

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS DECLARES IN REPLY TO DR. DANIEL'S QUESTIONING THAT COURTENAY BAY DEVELOPMENT IS A VISION OF THE FUTURE, AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT CONCERNED WITH IT AT PRESENT--THE SITUATION TO DATE AS EXPLAINED TO THE HOUSE.

Initial Move in Construction of Terminal Facilities Has Yet To Be Made--No Transfer of Property Has Taken Place, and None Is Immediately in Sight--What It Costs To Run The Fielding, and What the People Are Getting Out Of It.

The following is the text of the debate on Courtenay Bay dredging taken from the Hansard report of April 1--

St. John harbor, New Brunswick--improvements, \$450,000.

Mr. Pugsley--This is for the purpose of continuing the work of dredging in the harbor of St. John and of completing the new pier which is under construction. The work is all under contract, and we anticipate that this amount would be required during the current year.

Mr. Daniel--Will any of this be spent in Courtenay Bay?

Mr. Pugsley--I am unable to tell my hon. friend at the present time whether it will or not.

Mr. Daniel--Could the minister state whether the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners have purchased any land at the head of Courtenay Bay?

Mr. Pugsley--I may say to my hon. friend that I have been informed that they have agreed to purchase such land, but whether they have actually completed the purchase, I am not aware.

Mr. Daniel--Supposing that the purchase is made, would work be done on Courtenay Bay, would it not?

Mr. Pugsley--I always believe in deciding a matter when the necessity arises.

Mr. Daniel--Then the necessity will not arise in this case?

Mr. Pugsley--It does not follow.

Mr. Daniel--The minister has no information to give on the subject.

Mr. Pugsley--Not at the present moment.

Mr. J. Haggart--When the minister is getting a vote, and when an expenditure is to be made, it is to be made there or not. He should give precise information in reference to what he intends to do with the money.

Mr. Pugsley--Suppose he is unable to do so, what then?

Mr. J. Haggart--Well then, he is not justified in wanting for the money.

Cannot decide.

Mr. Pugsley--I may say to my hon. friend that the contracts which are now actually in existence upon the western side of the harbor will require all of this money, provided we keep the dredges upon the western side, but if the Grand Trunk Pacific should complete, as I apprehend they will, the purchase of the land around Courtenay bay, then, in the ordinary course, they would, I presume, submit plans for the consideration of the government in regard to the improvements which would be requisite in connection with terminal facilities. Then, it would be my duty to take up the question as to whether we would take some of the dredges that are now employed upon the western side and place them on Courtenay bay; but at the present moment I cannot decide that because I must know what the Grand Trunk Pacific intend to do before coming to a conclusion.

Mr. J. Haggart--Does not the minister think that it is perhaps more proper that this expenditure should have the consideration of the House rather than that it should be determined by himself? He has come here proposing an expenditure of money for a purpose; he should give the particular purpose for which the money is to be expended. In answer to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel), he says that he cannot tell whether a certain amount of money is to be expended or not. That is not an answer. He should have precise information.

Mr. Pugsley--I really think that upon reflection my hon. friend will see that I gave a frank statement of what is in my mind at the present time, and that is that the money would be expended upon the western side of the harbor. But, of course, the vote will enable us to expend it on either side of the harbor. If we deemed it necessary in the future to expend the money to that purpose, but at the present time it is in contemplation to expend all of this vote upon dredging and wharf building upon the western side of the harbor.

Mr. Daniel--Can the minister state whether it is the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific to purchase the land at the head of the bay?

Mr. Pugsley--I have been informed that it is the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific to purchase the land at Courtenay bay, but whether they have actually completed the purchase or not I am not aware.

Mr. Emmerson--The minister has stated that this expenditure might be made in Courtenay Bay. Have plans and specifications for that part of the work been prepared?

Mr. Pugsley--Borings have been made in Courtenay bay, and although incomplete they show that a depth of 22 feet of water at low tide can be got without striking rock. Preliminary plans have been prepared by the engineers of my department, although they are not sufficiently matured to enable me to give to the committee any details which would be of value. Before engaging in the work, of course careful consideration would be necessary, and detailed plans would have to be worked out.

Mr. Emmerson--I presume no contract will be asked for until the detail or working plans are prepared?

Mr. Pugsley--None would be entered into.

Mr. Emmerson--It is proposed to do this work by Government tenders or by private tenders for the work that may be decided on after plans have been completed?

Mr. Pugsley--Some time ago tenders were called by public advertisement for dredging in St. John harbor, including Courtenay bay. Tenders were received from three contractors: G. S. Hayes, if I remember, asked 74 cents per cubic yard; the Dominion Dredging Company asked 29 1/2 cents, and the Maritime Dredging and Contracting Company asked 36 cents per cubic yard, if done with an ordinary dipper dredge, or 25 cents per cubic yard if done with a suction or hydraulic dredge. No contract was entered into but the contract which was made for the dredging upon the west side

of the harbor it was stipulated that if the Government called upon the contractors to do the work of dredging in Courtenay bay they would do it at the price named in the tender. The question as to whether it should be done by Government dredges or by contract has not been determined. My own view is that the work should be done by Government dredges, but I think we could get it done more cheaply even than these low figures named, by anything which have heretofore been obtained at the port of St. John. When the last contracts were let, the side of the harbor, the lowest tender was that of G. S. Hayes at 40 cents a cubic yard. In considering a Government dredge we would have to determine the demands on the Government fleet of dredges in other places, and also the question of acquiring additional dredges for the purpose. That matter has not been considered by counsel, and will not be considered until we know whether the material was Grand Trunk Pacific propose to have their terminal at Courtenay bay, which I presume they will do if they complete the purchase of the land around Courtenay bay, which is the question we would best have to decide now, whether by contract or by Government dredges.

Mr. Daniel--In citing the Maritime Dredging and Contracting Company's tender at 25 cents per cubic yard, the minister omitted to state the qualifying clause, provided the material was behind revetment walls, etc.

Mr. Pugsley--That is so.

Mr. Daniel--It is not an ordinary tender?

Mr. Pugsley--That is the way in which dredging is done by a suction dredge. You have to do it in that way, you have a long pipe and the material is placed in that way.

Mr. Emmerson--From the information I have been able to gather from statements made in the house, tenders were asked for the work at Courtenay Bay in 1908. The tenders relating to Courtenay Bay were not accepted although the tenders were under obligation, if called upon, to perform the work which they offered to do, and, as I understand it, the contract was only entered into on behalf of the government with the western tenders who worked on the western side of the harbor.

Mr. Pugsley--That is correct.

Mr. Emmerson--The minister states that to complete detail working plans have been prepared and the extent of the work has not been determined by the department or the proposed expenditure. I have been led to believe that the dredging alone would cost two or three millions. I may be wrong, but I gathered from an answer in that house some weeks ago that when these tenders were invited only \$6,000 of a deposit was required. Evidently the government did not consider the work of the contractors when they only asked the contractors to furnish a deposit of \$6,000. Of course if the government only propose to carry out the contract and not have any work done in Courtenay Bay by these contractors, that would seem to be all right. But it is proposed to extend that work here do you think it is in the public interest to take a step involving so large an expenditure without inviting tenders for the work which has yet to be determined. Now the minister has stated that this vote is for the western side, and that possibly in consequence of some contingent action on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific it might be necessary to have the dredges on the western side of the harbor removed to Courtenay Bay to do that work. Then it must be in the mind of the minister that the contractors for the western side of the harbor propose to do the work on the Courtenay Bay side. I simply want to know whether that is in contemplation and if it is involved in this vote, because if it is, I would take serious exception to any reasons why that should not be done. I simply ask the minister that I may know, and that the country may know, his plans in respect to the matter.

Government Dredges.

Mr. German--I notice that the minister says he has not yet decided whether the work to be done in St. John harbor shall be done by contract or by government dredges. A year ago I asked for a return of the number of dredges owned by the government, and the work they had been doing during the last three years. The return shows the amount of work these dredges have done, and I have made up a statement of the relative cost of doing the work which has been done by government dredges, and the cost of work done by similar dredges which are owned by contractors; and I intend on another occasion to speak at greater length on this matter. But I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that work can be done, and is being done, by contractors at a cheaper price than the work that is being done by government dredges. The government owns at present an enormous fleet of dredges and dredging plants. I think they own a greater amount of dredging plant than they should own. I am absolutely opposed to doing work of that kind by government dredges. If the honorable minister will look at the work which was done by the dredge "W. S. Fielding" in St. John harbor during 12 months, he will find that the work done by that dredge, apparently working continuously for the 12 months, did not exceed the amount which such a dredge should do in two months. The dredge cost over \$600,000, and working for 12 months straight way, winter and summer, it moved less than 400,000 yards of material. A dredge which cost that much money ought to remove that material in two months.

Mr. Edwards--What kind of material?

Mr. German--Ordinary clay; this dredge would not work in any other kind of material, it would not work in hard material. It is an endless bucket dredge, and works only in comparatively soft material, it would not work in hard pan.

Mr. Pugsley--That is just what it is doing in St. John harbor, the very hardest kind of material.

Minister of Public Works Declares in Reply To Dr. Daniel's Questioning That Courtenay Bay Development Is a Vision of the Future, and That the Government Is Not Concerned With It At Present--The Situation To Date As Explained To the House.

Initial Move in Construction of Terminal Facilities Has Yet To Be Made--No Transfer of Property Has Taken Place, and None Is Immediately in Sight--What It Costs To Run The Fielding, and What the People Are Getting Out Of It.

Mr. German--I won't dispute the honorable gentleman because he apparently lives there. But my knowledge of such dredges is that they usually work in comparatively soft material, not in what is called hard pan and boulders, because the buckets are not large enough to hold large boulders. I believe that this minister looks over the records he will find that the government own at present all the dredges that they should own, and that the policy of the government in buying and building more dredges should be reversed, that work of this kind should be let by public tender, that it should be let to the lowest bidder, and there should be no arrangements made with bidders beforehand, but the man who is the lowest bidder on that particular job should get the work.

Mr. Pugsley--No.

Mr. J. Haggart--We know nothing about Courtenay bay until the hon. member for Westmorland gave the information.

A Return.

Mr. Emmerson--The information I gave was contained in a return made before the House.

Mr. Pugsley--Then I am only speaking for myself. I did not know the information until I heard it given by the hon. member for Westmorland. My assumption that there should be no expenditure of between two and three million dollars for dredging Courtenay bay, the plans and specifications, and an estimate of the cost, and a full statement of the work to be done should be given by the minister before he asks for a dollar.

The minister corrects himself. I would not venture upon the work without a subsequent vote. That was not the statement I made on the introduction of the vote. I have a faint recollection that it appeared that we were giving the minister power to make an expenditure in Courtenay bay. I protest against any such manner of introducing so important a vote--a vote that will add to the enormous expenditure which we are at present making on the Transcontinental railway, and which we should have the plans and specifications, and a complete estimate. What authority had the minister to ask for tenders for the purpose of beginning the work?

Mr. Pugsley--We had a vote in 1907 of \$400,000 for St. John harbor.

Mr. J. Haggart--That does not include Courtenay bay.

Mr. Pugsley--Yes it does.

Mr. J. Haggart--The vote for St. John harbor, we are now told, covers its expenditure on another vote which is a part of the harbor--a new harbor proposed for the west side of the harbor. That was never explained, and we would like to know anything for interest in the harbor proposed for the west side of the harbor. I am in the judgment of the engineer of the department, that that dredge should have done that amount of work in two months. An ordinary dipper dredge which will not cost more than \$300,000 will excavate 5,000 cubic yards of material in a day.

Mr. Pugsley--Ch no.

Mr. German--I know whereof I speak.

Mr. R. L. Borden--How much did the "Fielding" cost for ten ocean steamers?

Mr. German--She cost \$612,784; the cost of operating her for twelve months was \$61,271, and the cost of maintaining her for the twelve months \$14,112.

Mr. Boyce--How much did she earn?

Mr. German--I would not think she would be earning anything.

Mr. Boyce--What was the value of the work she did?

Every Dredge.

Mr. German--Taking operating and maintenance expenses, and without calculating anything for interest or depreciation, the cost would amount to about twenty-two cents per yard. What applies to the "Fielding" applies to every dredge owned by the government, as far as I can see.

Mr. Daniel--A dipper dredge could not operate at all where the "Fielding" has been operating, because she is exposed to a high wind and the roll of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. German--I am not saying anything about that, but let her do more work for the money which is being spent on her.

Mr. Pugsley--I know myself of dredges owned by contractors which have cost from \$100,000 to \$150,000 and more, and in fifty feet of water upon the sea coast they never make on an average more than from 1,000 to 1,500 cubic yards a day. There is not a dipper dredge in Canada that in fifty feet of water could dredge 5,000 cubic yards a day. My hon. friend (Mr. German) would want to pursue the inquiry further, and consider what is done by contract dredges working under similar conditions to the "Fielding". We are getting dredging done by contract as low as eleven cents in some places, while in other places we are paying ninety cents per cubic yard. Some dredges do work as low as one and a half cents per cubic yard, and others do it at twenty cents, forty cents, sixty cents; it all depends upon the conditions. The splendid hydraulic dredge "J. L. Tarte", does work at three or four cents per cubic yard under peculiarly advantageous circumstances.

Mr. Barnard--What does dredging cost per cubic yard on the Red river?

Mr. Pugsley--I have not that information at hand.

Mr. Barnard--What is the estimated total amount to be spent on St. John harbor including Courtenay Bay?

Extent of Work.

Mr. Pugsley--It depends entirely upon the extent of the work to be done and of course that depends upon the development of the business. The development of St. John as a winter port began in 1895 and since then the business has been increasing from year to year until now it has reached a volume of from twenty million to twenty-five million dollars of exports during the winter season. The number of steamers coming to that harbor is constantly increasing and we hope the number will continue to increase. It will take many many

years before St. John harbor will be finally completed. What it will eventually cost I am unable to say. At present we are building a wharf upon the western side of the harbor which will accommodate two additional steamers, we are doing dredging at a series of wharfs which already have been constructed and we are making provision for the building of an additional wharf in the near future which will give accommodation for two more steamers. When we have done that, I think we might let the work rest for a few years, until the trade develops still further, and there is a more urgent demand for additional wharfs.

Mr. Haggart--Can the minister give the total expenditure by his department and by the railway department on the harbor of St. John from 1887 to the present time?

Mr. Pugsley--I am sorry to say that I have not that information.

Mr. Armstrong--Has the minister received any serious complaints from Port Arthur to the effect that some of the contractors who were dredging there and who had orders to carry out the material in the night, frequently went out with only a few barrow fulls and that the inspectors were not going their duty in that district?

Mr. Pugsley--No such complaint has reached me.

Mr. Armstrong--Will the minister look into the matter?

Mr. Pugsley--If my hon. friend will be good enough to furnish me with any details he has in his possession, I shall be very glad to look into it.

Mr. Armstrong--I have reason to believe that it is worth the minister's while to look into the matter--to ask his inspectors at least.

Mr. Pugsley--It is last year that my hon. friend refers to?

Mr. Armstrong--Yes.

Mr. Pugsley--If my hon. friend has any further information and will give it to me, I shall be glad to have the matter investigated.

Mr. R. L. Borden--Do these improvements relate solely to improvements or do they include other matters?

Mr. Pugsley--They include dredging and the building of a wharf now under construction on the western side of the harbor.

Mr. R. L. Borden--Not on Courtenay Bay?

Mr. Pugsley--No.

Mr. R. L. Borden--How far is Courtenay Bay from that wharf?

Half a Mile.

Mr. Pugsley--The entrance to Courtenay Bay is less than half a mile. It begins just at the eastern side of what is ordinarily known as the harbor of St. John.

Mr. R. L. Borden--The minister obviously has some plan of improvement in contemplation when he is asking for this vote. The question was put to him a little while ago, and he did not answer it.

Mr. Pugsley--Yes, I have a complete plan of contemplated improvements on the West side, which it is hoped the business of the future will require--not the immediate future, but we must look forward a good many years in the case of a port which is rapidly developing. This plan includes dredging from Sand Point to the Beacon Bar, and a series of ships berths between these two points. When the development is finally completed, it will give additional accommodation for about ten ocean steamers.

Mr. R. L. Borden--Is this below the Canadian Pacific terminals?

Mr. Pugsley--Yes, to the southward.

Mr. R. L. Borden--How many berths are there now?

Mr. Pugsley--I think there is accommodation for six ocean steamers, and we are at present providing for two more. The plan contemplates in addition to these two, giving accommodation for about 18 steamers in all.

Mr. R. L. Borden--I also understood from the minister that he desires authority to devote a portion of this vote to development in Courtenay Bay.

Mr. Pugsley--No, we would require the greater part of this amount to complete the wharves which are now under construction on the West side and in order to finish up the dredging work for the additional wharf we are building to the south of Sand Point; and therefore, unless we had a further vote, it would be useless to take any part of this for the development of Courtenay Bay. No part of this will be devoted to that purpose. If we should ask for a further amount, then I will bring such a matter before the committee all necessary information in regard to it.

Clear Understanding.

Mr. R. L. Borden--I simply wanted a clear understanding of the matter. If any portion of this money is to be devoted to improvements at Courtenay Bay, then the country would, of course, be committed to some plan of development there, in which case we would want the minister's explanation. But I understand that no portion of this money will be devoted to the carrying out of any plan at Courtenay Bay until a further sum is asked for and full explanation of such plan are given to the committee.

Mr. Pugsley--Quite so.

Mr. R. L. Borden--Has the land at Courtenay Bay been acquired by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company?

Mr. Pugsley--I have been informed by the company that they had made an arrangement to purchase the land at Courtenay Bay, this will take in all the land at the head of the bay and also the foreshore right of Messrs. Gilbert, the owners of the property.

Mr. Daniel--How large an area?

Mr. Pugsley--The land at the head of the bay covers an area of about 75 acres, and the tide flats cover several hundred acres, of which the would be the riparian owners. Whether they have actually completed the purchase or not I have not been informed.

Mr. Daniel--I saw it stated in the press regarding the option said to be held for this purpose, that the area on the shore was 31 or 32 acres and that there was a similar area of 64 or 65 acres altogether.

Mr. Pugsley--I think my hon. friend has been misinformed as to that. I think it takes in all the head of Courtenay bay, extending from the Marsh creek around to the property owned by Mr. Dunn.

Mr. Daniel--The minister is not in a position to state whether the Grand Trunk Pacific intend to buy that additional area or not?

Mr. Pugsley--As I can say to my hon. friend is that the officials of the company have informed me that they have decided to purchase the property, but whether they have completed the purchase or not I am unable to say.

Mr. Todd--Could not facilities be provided for the accommodation of the Grand Trunk Pacific on the west side of the harbor? If so, it would save a very large expenditure which will otherwise have to be undertaken by this country in connection with the Courtenay bay project.

Ideal Site.

Mr. Pugsley--The company have so, through their officials, informed me, had their engineer at St. John and they are of the opinion that the ideal site would not, owing to the difficulty of the approach, afford to them the adequate facilities that they want for their terminal. The latter opinion is no doubt aware, in order to get to the west side they would have to use the Canadian Pacific railway, crossing over by their line at the falls and the going around to the terminals of the Canadian Pacific railway. Rival companies have serious objections to using each other's lines, I suppose, because of the difficulty of making arrangements. But the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific, Mr. Hays, has informed me that Courtenay bay presents an ideal site for terminals, and he has also told me that as a result of a visit to St. John of their engineer, he is of opinion that this presents the only opportunity at St. John which would enable them to get the terminal, as which they would desire for the great business they expect will go over the Transcontinental railway. They could get limited accommodation in connection with the intercolonial terminals, but their opinion is that Courtenay bay presents an ideal opportunity for railway terminals.

Mr. R. L. Borden--How many berths are there at the Intercolonial Railway terminals?

Mr. Pugsley--Only two, and they are filled all the time during the winter with the present business.

Mr. R. L. Borden--Are they capable of extension?

Mr. Pugsley--Other property might be bought at the head of the harbor, but the difficulty is to get the wharf space very limited at the head of the harbor, as my hon. friend from St. John knows.

Mr. Barnard--I understand that the wharves mentioned by the minister in connection with the harbor at St. John are wharves which are provided for the moving of commerce generally. How much wharfage has the minister there?

Mr. Pugsley--Of course, there are wharves in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. The latter wharf has two berths for ocean steamers at the head of the harbor and then there is also what is known as the ballast wharf, situated on the western side. But at the ballast wharf I do not think the water is deep enough for the largest ocean steamers. Upon the western side of the harbor, wharves have practically all, up to the present time, been constructed by the city of St. John.

Mr. Barnard--By private individuals?

Mr. Pugsley--No, by the corporation of St. John at their own expense, and the people have imposed on them a heavy burden. They have been called upon to provide terminal facilities for the trade of Canada, not for the local trade, but to enable the exports and imports of Canada in the winter season to pass through a Canadian port. They have expended in the vicinity of \$1,250,000 for that purpose. It has been expended for a national purpose, and they have not felt that they could go any further. They came to me when I was elected and became minister and urged that further facilities ought to be provided at the expense of Canada, keeping in mind all they had done for the national purpose. Then, with the approval of my colleagues, entered upon the construction of a wharf extension of the wharves which had been built by the city upon the western side of the harbor, and the department is now building an additional wharf which will give accommodation for two more ocean steamers on the western side. They have in contemplation, in the near future, the building of another wharf to the south of Sand Point which will give accommodation for two more steamers.

Mr. Barnard--There are no private owned docks?

Mr. Pugsley--Not for ocean steamers.

Wm. Taylor's Body Found at Nashwauk.

Fredericton, N. B., April 4.--The body of a man supposed to be that of William Taylor of Marysville, who was drowned in the Nashwauk River at Marysville last November, was found at the mouth of the Nashwauk shortly before noon today by George Upton, who was gathering up driftwood. The body was badly decomposed. Taylor, who left a wife and child, was about 35 years of age. He was crossing the river from his work to dinner and used an old milldam for a short cut. A plank on the dam gave way, throwing him into the river, and he was never seen after. Coroner Weaver held an inquest, and the tide flats cover several hundred acres, of which the would be the riparian owners. Whether they have actually completed the purchase or not I have not been informed.

THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE.

Detroit, Mich., April 3.--Twenty five hundred Michigan churches today devoted their meetings to exercises in the interest of the Anti-Saloon League preparatory to the voting tomorrow on the local option question in 36 counties in his state. Parades of women and trained choirs of children singing temperance hymns were features of the last day of a "wet" and "dry" campaign which has been most bitterly fought.

The campaign of the "wets" was of locally ended last night.