

at any rate I trust that when we meet—what is it?—the new National Government, my honourable friend from Halifax will support me in urging that consideration shall be given to the winter port trade.

Hon. H. W. RICHARDSON: I notice that the motion calls attention to the port of Quebec, stating that it is properly equipped for the handling of grain and other merchandise, and that the exporters should use that port as much as possible. That is a very creditable motion, and it deals with a matter of great importance at the present time. When steamships are so scarce as they are at present, any saving that can be made in the voyage from North America to Europe should be made. It is desirable to use the port of Quebec, which is the closest to Europe—closer than New York or Montreal. There is a saving of a day, or a day and a half, in the voyage between Quebec and Liverpool as compared with the voyage from Montreal to Liverpool. A 10,000-ton ship is now worth, I suppose, from \$3,000 to \$5,000 a day; so that in a day and a half a saving of from \$5,000 to \$7,000 is effected by using the port of Quebec. Now, I am coming down to dollars and cents, because, after all, we may have all the elevators we want, and do all the dredging that is required, but if the merchandise cannot be sent most cheaply through that port all the dredging or elevator accommodation is of no use. Grain, like water, will flow through the easiest channel, that is, the cheapest channel. I have been engaged in the grain trade since 1873 and have followed the export trade closely. My firm was among the first to ship Manitoba wheat to Europe. No matter how loyal I have been to Canada or how anxious to build up Canadian trade, I have been forced many times in the past to use American ports to forward my grain to Europe.

Now, let us go back and see what has been the cause of this. The United States were exporters of grain long before we were. When our trade was in its infancy theirs was at its zenith, and the practice was established of shipping grain through American ports. Railways and elevator systems were built for the purpose of handling grain going in that direction, and the lines of boats were calling at American ports to move the grain. That system cannot be changed in a day, but it is changing year by year. There are now only one or two United States ports which are regular line

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE.

shippers—the ports of New York and Boston; the other ports are tramp shippers. For instance, Baltimore is an immense shipper of grain, but it ships almost entirely by tramp boats. Portland is a big shipper of grain—Canadian grain most of it, sent by the Grand Trunk. Some Chicago grain, it is true, goes to Portland, but nine-tenths of the shipments going to that port come from our Northwest. Why? Because Portland is closer than any other port to the inland shipping points. The Grand Trunk is using Portland exclusively for its winter exports. Because both Halifax and St. John are farther, it costs more money to move the grain to Halifax and St. John—there is no question about it; and it is going to be very hard to overcome these difficulties.

Again, the port of Buffalo is a late fall port. It is open at the very close of navigation. It has an immense elevator system.

While I am on this subject I am going to speak very plainly. There is, so far as I am aware, no elevator in the United States built by the Government. The trade have built the grain elevators, and they are located on the routes best adapted for trade, where most money can be made out of them. When a government undertakes to build an elevator at one port—for instance, at the port of Montreal—other ports claim an equal right to assistance. Quebec asks for aid, as Quebec has a right to do, and receives it. Then Halifax and St. John do likewise. This assistance would never have been necessary if the erection of elevators had been left entirely to the trade.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: I do not know.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDSON: The Government have taken the matter out of the hands of the trade and have built the elevators.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: Let me ask my honourable friend why the work started at Courtenay bay, at St. John, was left after a considerable amount of money, a million or two dollars, had been spent. If it was not to be used, why should it have been started? There is an inner story to that, but I do not want to go into it.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not able to answer why the Government does certain things, but I suppose it is the ambition of the Government to encourage the export of Canadian products through Canadian ports as much as possible; or it should be.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: Yes, that is right.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDSON: Let us consider the grain trade. I will give you a little in-