

Quebec Harbour

seriously ask my hon. friend: Does he think it good business for this Government to issue bonds for any such purpose as mentioned? The explanation given by my hon. friend simply adds so much more force to what has been stated before as to the position of the Quebec Harbour Commission. They are owing the country these millions of dollars interest in arrears. Of course it is an investment, as my hon. friend knows, because the money could only be advanced in that way. It is intended to be, and really is an investment. In fact, it is an investment in Montreal, and will be an investment in Vancouver. But over and above all those tremendous losses, we find now that the business of this port obtained by the board is so small that they cannot keep up their current painting. Surely, it is about time they stopped issuing bonds for any such purpose.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is the fair wage clause inserted in all contracts given by this corporation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have already said that I shall see that the Harbour Commission inserts such a clause. I am in favour of such a clause in all contracts on subsidized work.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): When was the last appropriation made for this port?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In 1917, five years ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the hon. gentlemen is wrong about that. That was the date of the legislation. The hon. gentleman was not asking as to enabling legislation, but as to when the last appropriation was made.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The money has been paid from time to time since 1917. There is no more money now that can be advanced under the legislation.

Mr. CLARK: Did I understand the hon. minister to say there had been no appropriation made for the harbour from 1919 to 1921?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I did not say that. I said the last legislation granting advances to the harbour was passed in 1917.

Mr. CRERAR: No appropriations have been made since then.

Mr. CLARK: The appropriation of 1916-17 was \$1,532,244.33; in 1917-18, \$1,121,413.40; in 1918-19, \$875,503.72; in 1919-20, \$258,276.09; in 1920-21, \$181,877.89, making [Sir Henry Drayton.]

a total of \$9,573,085.97, from 1896 to 1921, as compared with \$5,151,867.65 for the port of Montreal, and \$4,415,860.64 for Vancouver.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All these appropriations are part of the legislation.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 78, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS**NIAGARA RIVER BRIDGE COMPANY**

On the Order for the second reading of Bill No. 61, respecting Niagara River Bridge Company.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a rather important bill and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) is not in the House. I do not know anything about the matter and am not aware whether or not there is any objection to the bill, which has reference to an international bridge that is being constructed by a combination of two companies, one incorporated by the state of New York and the other by the province of Ontario, or possibly by the Dominion of Canada. This bill possibly might encroach on certain provincial powers, but as to that I do not know.

Mr. STEVENS: Should it not go to the Railway Committee? That is the proper forum.

Mr. GRAHAM: The principle of the bill is all right, and I am quite agreeable to its being referred to the Railway Committee, so long as it is understood that we do not acquiesce in its provisions, because as yet I do not fully understand them.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Meighen the bill was referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

PRIVATE BILLS**SECOND READINGS**

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate) for the relief of Ethel Turner.—Mr. Duff.