

up the question this evening of these works for which we are asking no money this year; because, I would have been prepared to give him a distinct answer. I hope, if he has other matters of the kind, he will give me till next day, at all events, and then I will be prepared to give him the information.

Mr. McISAAC. I will take the information on Concurrence. I have no desire to press the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible that I should be prepared on every work for which a supply is not asked. As to McNair's Cove, I would like him to be a little more precise in his dates. He said the work was carried away in 1881, or in 1880, or in 1879. It might be 1878. I would like to know exactly what year it was, so that I might be able to answer him. If the work is all carried away—

Mr. McISAAC. Not quite all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The fact that I asked \$5,000 last year shows that we were informed differently, and that I was taking care of the work. Perhaps that \$5,000 was not enough and we might have asked more this year, but my attention was not called to it.

Mr. McISAAC. Less than \$5,000 would have been sufficient, if expended in 1880, when the damage was first done, but it is the neglect to apply the money in time that has made it worse.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Let the hon. gentleman not speak of neglect. Let us wait until Concurrence, and we will fight it out then.

Mr. McISAAC. There will be no fight about it. The money will settle it.

Mr. KIRK. I have looked to see if there was a revote proposed for certain breakwaters for which a vote was taken in 1882, in the county of Guysboro'. Last year I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister, and when the Estimates were under discussion he promised that he would carry out a suggestion of mine, that an engineer should be sent down to examine those harbours to see what it would cost to erect breakwaters to meet the wants of the fishermen. I asked the question here this winter, whether the promise on that occasion had been carried out, and he answered me by saying he thought I had made a mistake, and intimated that no such promise had been made. In answer to me, he quoted from his answer given last year, which was:

"When the time came to use the vote of \$3,000 appropriated by Parliament, enquiries were instituted as to the total amount required to make it a really useful work. It was found that the amount was so large the Government were not prepared at that time to proceed with the work."

That was his answer, when I asked if it was the intention of the Government to expend this money in erecting those breakwaters; but, when the question came up on a vote in the Estimates, I explained to the Minister that I did think he was justified in withholding the expenditure of the money, the \$3,000, from the fact that the Engineer, in 1874, had reported that it would cost \$53,000 to build a breakwater, and I thought it was hardly reasonable to expect him to expend \$3,000 on the building of a breakwater when it would cost \$53,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What harbour is that?

Mr. KIRK. New Harbour, in the county of Guysboro'. I suggested that in order to ascertain what it would really cost to build a breakwater for the necessities of the fishermen there, he should send an Engineer during the recess to examine it, and he promised me to carry out that suggestion. I said:

"I am not finding fault with the hon. Minister for acting as he has done. The fact that the Engineer of the Department reported that this

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

work would cost \$53,000 was, I think, a sufficient reason for refusing to undertake it with 3,000. But this report was given while the policy of the Government was not to undertake any work of a local nature. This policy, however, has been changed by the Government, they having decided to build smaller breakwaters for the benefit of the fishermen. What I should suggest is, that the Government send their Engineer there again to see what a breakwater would cost that would be serviceable for the fishermen."

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a proper suggestion, and I will do that."

Now, you see it was the Minister himself who made the mistake as to his not having made that promise, and not I. I was expecting that an Engineer would be sent down, and that the Minister would be prepared during this Session to propose an additional vote or a revote of the \$3,000, with perhaps an addition for the breakwater at New Harbour, but on looking over the Estimates I do not find there is any revote of \$3,000 or any other sum; and I therefore hope he will place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates this year and carry out the suggestion made last year that an Engineer in the meantime, during the recess, before the money is expended, will examine the harbour and report what it will cost. If it is found that a breakwater suitable to the fishermen will cost \$53,000, I will not ask him to expend a dollar, because I do not think so large a sum should be expended on such a work for local purposes. My impression, however, is that a work sufficient for all purposes can be erected for \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year we had no vote of money for this work, and, therefore, as there was no vote, there could not be a revote. The hon. gentleman says I promised there would be an examination made. Does he say there has been no examination made?

Mr. KIRK. Not since the promise was made, that I know of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If I made a promise, I have no doubt the Engineer has fulfilled my promise. It is impossible for me to say, at the present moment, whether an Engineer was sent there or not. When a promise is made, I give the order. I am not in a position to say whether there will be a vote or not, but there is no revote, because there was no vote last year. In the meantime, I will see what the report has been about this case, and if it is possible to submit an item to my colleagues before coming down here with the Supplementary Estimates, I will do so.

Mr. KIRK. The Minister will remember that although there was no vote in the Estimates last year, he explained to the House that it was not necessary to revote the money of 1882, because it could be expended any time before, I think he said, the 1st of November; and there was no need to vote it again; that in the meantime he would send the Engineer, and if he found the money could be usefully expended he would have it expended before the time expired.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, P.E.I.

112. South River, Murray Harbour \$1,250 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the report was not favourable. There is \$1,250 to complete Murray Harbour, South River. This is a revote. It is for the purpose of improving the channel so as to provide for a comparatively straight channel, and make it both wider and deeper.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the harbour of St. Peter's Bay, for which I see no vote in the Estimates. In 1882 the sum of \$6,000 was voted to complete the breakwater there on the east side, the part on the west side being completed during the Mackenzie Administration. There was a contract entered into with a man named Sinnott, and last year, I believe, he performed a certain portion of that work, but last fall a storm carried away the larger portion of it. Now, I may state to the hon. Minister that, personally, I am not aware of the facts, but