

from the town of Haileybury, or in what way was the work brought about? Was there a request for it, and if so, from whom?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The request came from more than one source. If I remember correctly, the member for that constituency received a letter similar to the one which my hon. friend must have received, asking for suggestions as to works that could be carried on with advantage to the constituency, and which at the same time would afford relief for unemployment. In that way the suggestion came in. I believe that the board of trade also, or the corporation of Haileybury itself, made similar representations.

Mr. SANDERSON: Then the minister did get a request from the board of trade of Haileybury.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes.

Mr. SANDERSON: Won't the minister be frank with me? Was it not at the request of his colleague, the Minister of Labour, that the work was gone on with in his own constituency?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): As I have said, every member was invited to make suggestions and I have no doubt that the member for that constituency, who happens to be the Minister of Labour, my colleague, whom I appreciate very much, having the interests of his constituency at heart and understanding the conditions up there, was asked whether the suggestion that came in from the board of trade was a good one or not.

Mr. SANDERSON: I want to pursue this a little further. I see a reference to breakwater and harbour for seaplanes. Does the Minister of Public Works think that this was a general work for the advantage of Canada, and can he tell me whether his engineers or any official of his department can say how many seaplanes land at Haileybury in a given length of time?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The breakwater was necessary as such. It not only afforded protection to the wharf and harbour, but it also serves as a landing base for seaplanes. I am informed that several planes are operating there at the present time.

Mr. SANDERSON: How many are employed on the works now?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am sorry, I haven't that information.

Mr. SANDERSON: What is the weekly or monthly pay sheet there?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I don't know; I have not the information.

Mr. SANDERSON: Will the minister be good enough to get that information and give it to me?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If my hon. friend desires that information, I shall be very glad to endeavour to secure it for him and send it, but I haven't got it here.

Mr. SANDERSON: There is one more item in Ontario that I want to inquire about. Further down the list there is this item: "Port Arthur—Rubble Mound breakwater, \$100,000." The amount expended in connection with this item was \$99,999.25; apparently there is a balance of 75 cents. Were tenders asked for?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes. It was a continuation of a contract which I believe was awarded by the former government. It was a long breakwater to which another section was added. There was the same thing last year, for the relief of unemployment also.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Apparently the constituencies represented by ministers were in special need of relief.

Mr. MANION: When did Port Arthur get a minister to represent it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am referring to Haileybury, and I am going to refer to some other constituencies in my own province. In common with other members, I received a letter after the session last year, asking for suggestions with regard to public works in the city of Quebec which might afford unemployment relief. I sent in quite a list, but I am afraid none of my suggestions were accepted. I have here the report of the director—and I am pleased to see my good friend the Minister of Marine in the house. At pages 64 and 65 appear the details of the works which were carried out in the province of Quebec—public buildings, harbours and rivers, in connection with which work was done out of the unemployment relief money. I see that up to February 29, 1932, a total of \$415,606.78 was expended. Now in the county of Chambly, which is represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, there is, first of all for Chambly, a protection wall, the amount being \$19,954.79. At Longueuil, another place in my hon. friend's constituency, there was also provision for a protection wall. Obviously they are in need of protection there.

Mr. BENNETT: Practising it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And practising it as well. The amount expended at Longueuil was \$19,-