

could well apply it elsewhere. No doubt, the people of Ste. Emilie would be glad to accept the whole of this amount, without it having to undergo the clipping of the conservative machinery which would leave, out of \$35,000, practically nothing for the public to benefit by.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I gather the hon. member for Lotbiniere is protesting against the proposed expenditure on a wharf in his constituency. That is indeed unusual.

Mr. STEVENS: And refreshing.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Certainly it requires some consideration. I would be the last one to force upon any constituency any public work it does not need or want. Last year the reports from our engineer, upon which we place a good deal of weight and in which we have confidence, pointed out that this wharf was in very bad repair, that the traffic was very heavy, and that unless the wharf was renewed a heavier expenditure would be involved in the near future. Tenders were invited, the lowest of which was for the sum of \$12,420, not the larger amount mentioned by the hon. member. On a review of the situation, and owing to the fact that the investigations were made late in the season, it was decided that the work could stand over until this year. Now the hon. member seems to think it might stand over until next year. I am inclined to accept his suggestion.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I wish to thank you, sir, for postponing this vote. I contend that the saw-mill having been demolished, there is no further need to repair the wharf. My opposition to this \$35,000 outlay arises from a desire to economize that amount to the country. What member would rise in the house and state: I shall save the country \$35,000. I do so, the house must take my word that the outlay is unnecessary or else must seek the truth of my statement on the spot. If the house does not care to make the necessary inquiries in my constituency, then, let them take my word.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Granted.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): May I inquire the name of the tenderer.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Wilfrid Robidoux, for \$12,420.

Mr. VERVILLE: I am satisfied, thank you.

Mr. DUPUIS: Under this item there is a vote of \$23,000 for dredging at Rivière la Guerre, and further, under item 124 there is a vote of \$215,500 for dredging in Ontario and Quebec. We have in the counties of Laprairie

[Mr. Verville.]

and Napierville a river called La Petite Rivière Montreal, about which the minister knows the details. Upon my request to the federal and provincial governments this river was dredged in 1929 and 1930. With its source somewhere in the neighbourhood of the border between the United States and Canada, this river flows into the Richelieu, passing through the counties of Huntingdon and Napierville and the township of Sherrington. In Sherrington there is an area of about 1,100 acres of good land which used to be flooded in the spring and fall, and mostly during the greater part of the summer. As the minister knows, dredging operations were commenced at Napierville, and a large amount of money was spent upon the dredging operations until they had reached a certain point in Sherrington county. I am informed that there is about one mile of river in soft land still to be dredged, and it will be very easy for the department to finish the work. From the minister's letter of February 11, I would judge that his reason for not proceeding further with the work is that he believes he has spent enough money in operations on that river, and that during these days when economies must be made the expenditure of \$2,000 more would not be justified. Upon our request the Quebec department of agriculture were ready to contribute \$2,000 towards the completion of the work, provided the federal Department of Public Works would furnish the same amount. I would not dare to ask that this department spend a large amount of money if in the first place the proposed work were not useful, and if in the second place it were not already partly completed; because in these times when all departments are bound to economize I think we should not ask for a large amount of money. But without any reflection on the wisdom of the item, if the department is ready to spend as large an amount as that already in the estimates for Rivière la Guerre, I think the small amount for which I am now asking, \$2,000, should be granted. There has been some criticism on the part of my opponents in my constituency—I will not give names—that I was negligent in this matter, because in Sherrington, in the vicinity of this river, there are large numbers of good farmers, good citizens, who happen to be Conservatives. I think the two descriptions can go together; I am not so narrow-minded a Grit as to think that among Conservatives there are not good citizens. A large number of these citizens in Sherrington are Conservatives, and they attacked me because I am supposed to have neglected to ask for this small amount. I know well to do