

this abandonment on the part of the town took place, they would not build the dyke. As I stated before, the dyke was properly built, but the town of Laprairie was forced to abandon a certain piece of land along the shore of the St. Lawrence river. If the Department of Roads are the sole owners of that piece of land, I believe there should be some remedy. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I am not making this statement simply for purposes of political expediency. The minister knows perfectly well that I do not bother him very often. I must tell him, however, that in respect to this matter I am pressed by the public not only of Laprairie-Napierville, but of Beauharnois, Chateaugay and Huntingdon. The town of Laprairie has received request after request for the reopening of the road but has not been able to comply, because, owing to the conditions prevailing on the road, and the state in which it was left by the federal Department of Public Works, the reopening has been forbidden.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. DUPUIS: No, it is not carried. I hope the minister will give me a favourable answer.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do not believe I can add anything to what I have already stated. The hon. member has explained the situation from his standpoint, and I have explained it from mine.

Mr. DUPUIS: Give me \$10,000.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I cannot promise him that this year I can authorize an expenditure of that amount on the road.

Mr. CARDIN: I understand that following the cancellation of a contract awarded to an Ontario company for the building of a pier in the port of Sorel, a claim for damages has been filed. Is the minister in a position to inform me as to what has become of that claim?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am informed that a claim was made and an adjustment effected by taking over certain materials on hand. I am not aware of any outstanding claim. As the hon. member knows, the contract involved an extensive expenditure for which there was no parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. CARDIN: Will the minister supply me with the details of the settlement?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes. I will give the hon. member particulars concerning the action taken by the department.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers Ontario

Under contract—

Leamington—harbour improvements, \$93,000.

Midland—harbour improvements, \$73,000.

Essential undertakings—

Belleville—dredging, \$22,500.

Blind River—dredging, \$47,000.

Cobourg—dredging, \$17,000.

Depot Harbour—dredging, \$15,200.

Fort William—wharf extension, \$6,500.

Key Harbour—harbour improvements, \$15,000.

Kincardine—harbour repairs and improvements, \$18,000.

Oshawa—harbour improvements, \$35,000.

Port Hope—dredging, \$12,400.

Rockport—wharf, \$1,900.

Sault Ste. Marie—harbour repairs and improvements, \$13,000.

Sydenham and Chenal Escarte—dredging, \$19,000.

Toronto—harbour improvements, \$22,300.

Wallaceburg—wharf and warehouse, \$9,500.

Windsor—warehouse extension, \$60,000.

Harbours and rivers generally for maintenance of services, no new works to be undertaken, \$200,000.—Total, \$680,300.

Mr. GRAY: For some time the minister has been considering work in connection with a warehouse on the wharf at Sarnia, and I should like to know why some amount is not placed in the estimates for that work. I make the inquiry because I find he has included in the estimate the sum of \$9,500 to be expended in Wallaceburg, which is situated in a neighbouring constituency. I have no fault to find with the Wallaceburg expenditure, but I do say to the minister that having proceeded to the extent of asking for tenders for the construction of the warehouse on the public dock at Sarnia, and having gone to the point where those tenders have been practically awarded, with the exception of actual closing, to a Chatham firm, I wonder why the work was not proceeded with. We are in dire need of a warehouse at Sarnia, at which point there is a harbour second to none on the great lakes. We have there a public wharf all ready for a warehouse, but without the facilities of a warehouse proper use cannot be made of the wharf. I should like to ask why the minister has included in the estimates an expenditure for a neighbouring constituency and has left out the city of Sarnia.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I understand the proposition in Sarnia involved the extension of the wharf and the building of a large warehouse thereon. Then, there is some trackage which is not completed. It is perfectly true that the item did appear in the estimates, and tenders were asked for. No contract was awarded, and therefore no contract was cancelled. This is just another case where, faced