

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps he is an inspector.

Mr. LOGGIE. I think you will find that the wharfinger only keeps a percentage of the money.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have looked through the Auditor General's Report several times to find out how this man gets his money, and can find nothing to indicate where this money goes, but I know it is paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give instructions to have the matter looked into.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This will complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Carleton—repairs to wharf, \$1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is recommended by the resident engineer, Mr. Amyot. This wharf was built in 1882-3.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I find that this is a recognized summer resort and therefore, according to the report, the wharf should be kept in order. But it is rather singular that these reports should have been delayed until the election month. The work, which was done by day labour, was begun October 5. Here is a description of the work:

The old beach protection, situated a few acres west of the wharf, has been replaced by a new round timber construction 350 feet long, 6 feet wide and 4 feet high, well ballasted with stone.

I should like to know wherein that differs from the beach protection work on the Fraser river, which we were told could not be given because of some constitutional difficulty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This beach protection done at Carleton, was simply a renewal of the old work which had been done years ago. It is not at all improper that the government should repair works it constructed and which had got out of repair.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Then are we to understand that it will be perfectly in order to make application for repair to old beach protections?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they were built by this government originally, I think that would not be out of the way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes—estimated cost, \$1,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the revenue last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no revenue—this work has not been transferred.

Chateauguay—wharf on south shore of Lake St. Louis, between Woodland and Bellevue—revote of \$2,900 lapsed, \$8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work, it is represented, is very much needed in order to enable steamers to call.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the former vote of \$2,900 part of a larger vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote of \$3,000, from which there was an expenditure of only \$73.25. The remainder lapsed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is this work to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By tender and contract in the usual way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there any private wharfs there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a dilapidated private wharf, but the public feel that it is of no use to them. We have been urged by resolution of the municipal council to do this work. It is expected that the shipments from this wharf will reach at least \$100,000 annually, and will include hay, cattle, fruit and general farm produce. This is an important place.

Chicoutimi—harbour improvements, \$15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete a work which is under contract, consisting of harbour improvements in the Saguenay river at Chicoutimi, also to make renewals and repairs of the old government pier there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work we have in hand. The amount of the contract was \$55,455.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the improvement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The extension of the old wharf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, why call it 'harbour improvements'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is some little additional work in renewing the old government pier. That will be done by day work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this really the construction of a wharf or the improvement of a harbour? I thought 'harbour improvements' included some such thing as dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It includes that and wharf construction as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a pretty substantial sum for a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to have a concrete superstructure. It will be a very substan-