

Supply—Public Works

all sorts of things. I think the Leader of the Opposition is not quite fair in trying to intimate that this constitutes the works plan of the government.

Mr. Pearson: I want to be fair but I would also point out that when the billion dollar plus program was put forward last February it included a great many things which were not specifically public works at all. I am making a comparison between that billion dollar program and the program we have outlined here. I quite agree that a lot of these things I have mentioned do not come under the jurisdiction of my hon. friend.

Mr. Green: This does not include, for example, the over a quarter of a billion dollars spent on housing.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is not in the estimates at all.

Mr. Pearson: That is not included in the estimates we are discussing at all. I am talking about works, whether or not under public works. Surely my hon. friend will agree that when the \$1,085 million public works program to cure unemployment was put forward a couple of months ago it included a great many things which did not have any relationship whatever to a new public works program. That is confirmed by the estimates of this year. That is the point I am trying to make.

As the last observation I wish to make until we get to the details of the minister's estimates, may I point out that the minister said this morning that no projects had been delayed or cancelled by the government when it came into power last June, although he qualified that statement a little later in a way which I will indicate. I think it is pretty clear in the minds of most of us that when the new government took over last June they were very preoccupied indeed with the desirability of reducing expenditures. They said so and they took action towards that end, and at a time when they were more concerned with that than with the possibilities of unemployment. In connection with the action which they took surely the minister, after reflecting, will now agree that some quite important projects were postponed, if not cancelled. He mentioned this morning that there were only two he could think of and that they were minor ones involving a breakwater in front of a Liberal farm instead of a Conservative farm along the St. Lawrence river or something of that nature and he also seemed to recall a post office or federal building in London, Ontario.

Mr. Green: No.

Mr. Pearson: I mean London, England. That was a Canadian building in London, and I can certainly understand the government's attitude with regard to the postponement of that building if it were a question of public works for employment purposes because not many Canadians are being employed in the construction of that building. I know some of the difficulties about that building too which probably warranted some delay.

But last autumn the hon. member for Levis asked a question about this matter, being question No. 182 in the following words:

1. Has the government decided not to proceed during the present fiscal year with certain of the projects provided for in the main and supplementary estimates of the Department of Public Works?
2. If so, what projects?

The answer to that question is found on page 2640 of *Hansard* for December 19, 1957. I am going to read the items. There are a good many of them. Here are some of the projects which were postponed last year: New Glasgow, federal building; Oromocto, federal building; Dorion, federal building; Nicolet, federal building; Quebec, postal terminal; Morrisburg, post office; Emerson, Manitoba, customs building; Glacier national park, federal housing; Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, harbour improvements; Pleasant Harbour, Nova Scotia, breakwater-wharf; Port Hood, Nova Scotia, breakwater; Port Medway, New Brunswick, breakwater reconstruction; Back Bay, New Brunswick, wharf extension; Ste. Agathe des Monts, wharf; Ste. Flavie, dredging; Mutton Bay, Quebec, wharf; Pointe au Pere, wharf improvements; Little Cascapedia river, dredging.

Mr. Green: May I ask the Leader of the Opposition whether that return he has just read does not include an explanation in each case? In fairness, he should have read the explanation. For example, we find this:

Location	Project	Reason
New Glasgow, N.S.	Federal bldg.	Site unsettled.
Oromocto, N.B.	Federal bldg.	Site unsettled.
Dorion, P.Q.	Federal bldg.	Drawings had to be changed.
Nicolet, P.Q.	Federal bldg.	Site unsettled.

This was not a case of the government cancelling them at all. It was a case of difficulties which had arisen in the course of the work of the department. It is not a case of the department postponing them at all. The Leader of the Opposition should not try to picture them as deliberate postponements.

Mr. Pearson: It is quite true that reasons are given after each of these projects.