

Montreal inward, and nearly nine-tenths probably of all the produce which goes out of Montreal is the product of Ontario and the western provinces, and there is not a man in any portion of that part of the Dominion who is not interested in the fact that produce can be landed and sent inward or outward from the port of Montreal cheaply or efficiently and without impediment. Now, if you consider that for one moment as a fact, you will see that it is to your interest—I speak to the members of all the Dominion west of Montreal—it is to your interest to see that no unnecessary burdens shall be placed on the harbour of Montreal; in fact it is entitled to equal justice with every part of the Dominion. The hon. Secretary of State a moment ago said the intention of the bill was that this portion of the loan, \$750,000, should be expended in a particular part of the harbour and not in another part. He specified exactly that the dry dock was to be built—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, the dry dock was mentioned, but docks and wharfs are also mentioned.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The two million dollars is applicable to docks and wharfs, but the \$750,000 which is taken out of the two million is largely concerned, if not exclusively, in the building of the dry dock.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know that. The primary object, I understand, is wharfs, etc., for it reads:

Shall apply the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars towards the building or the improvement of wharfs, structures and other accommodations, including the building of a dry dock, in that part of the harbour of Montreal below the point known as St. Mary's Current.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The hon. Secretary of State must have been informed that it was the intention of the harbour commissioners to expend any money that they borrowed under this bill in the western part of the harbour. He has no evidence whatever, not the first iota of evidence to bear him out in that supposition. It is a mere red herring drawn across the trail to endeavour to enlist the sectional feeling in the city of Montreal with regard to these harbour improvements, and I for one deprecate the idea of any racial or sectional feeling being introduced into this business at all. There is no reason whatever why the French

who principally reside in the east end, and the English who principally reside at the west end, should not be a unit on this question, because it is not a racial or sectional question at all. I go on a broader principle, that the harbour dues and the cost of importing goods into the city of Montreal should be kept down to the lowest point consistent with the public service. Now, is it a fact that the expenditure under the management of the board of harbour commissioners has been principally in the west end? No, it is not. I am misinformed if the fact is not entirely the other way. The extent of new wharfage built in the last twenty-five years is as follows. The east end of Montreal—

Hon. Mr. DE BOUCHERVILLE—Where does the east end begin?

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The Canadian Pacific Railway station, which a few years ago was the extreme eastern end of the harbour; taking as a central line, the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators at the Dalhousie station, there have been built in the east end of the city 12,800 lineal feet of wharfs, while west of these elevators there have been built, in the same time, 2,870 feet of wharfs, or about four times as much at the east end. The money spent upon them during the last twenty-five years has been \$504,000 in the west end, as against \$1,100,000 in the east end. I for one do not grudge that. I have no complaint to make of that. If the business of the port requires it, if wharfs are to be built in the harbour, I do not grudge the fact that these wharfs have been built in the east instead of in the west end, but I frown down the attempt to insinuate that the harbour in the west end is being attended to and money spent on it, while it is neglected in the east end. The contrary is largely the case.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—In the plans that have been discussed in the last two or three years, was it not the enlargement of the docks at the west end?

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The question was discussed and was the subject of much deliberation. I was president of the board of trade at the time—I do not remember the year—and chairman of the committee which, after a due consideration of all the plans, fixed on the plan which is known as number six, and that plan is largely con-