

the government of Canada undertook to pay interest on one-third of the cost of the work for twenty years.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—Was it not on a fixed sum?

Hon. Mr. POWER—A sum not exceeding so much. It was supposed to be one-third of the cost. That is what it worked out at any rate. There was one dry-dock built under that Act in Halifax. There was a natural desire expressed by gentlemen who were interested in other ports to have further dry-docks constructed. It was found that with the subsidies provided by the existing law it was impossible to secure persons who would be willing to undertake the construction of docks in these other places. As a result of that, the subsidy was increased, the proportion which the government was willing to pay was increased, and the length of time extended. In the first dry-dock, the interest on one-third of the cost was payable for only twenty years. Then the period was increased, but no serious proposition was made to construct other docks. We have this condition of things, that the government propose practically and substantially to build the docks. The first paragraph in clause 8 says that the government shall pay a sum not exceeding three and a half per cent of the cost of the work for a period not exceeding thirty-five years. The money can be got for three and a half per cent, and practically the country will pay for the building of the dock.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—Not necessarily altogether.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Substantially. It is not limited as in the case of the original dry-dock to any sum.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Yes, to \$4,000,000,

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not object to dry-docks being built in any place where business calls for them; but if the government are prepared to pay for the construction of a dry-dock, the result will be you will find dry-docks built in places where the business does not call for them.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—Build at Quebec. There is business for them there.

Hon. Mr. POWER.

Hon. Mr. POWER—If my hon. friend had not been so fast, I was about to say that the amount of shipping passing in and out of the St. Lawrence is so great that business demands would call for the construction of a dock somewhere in the neighbourhood of Quebec. But the difficulty about this enactment is that there is nothing whatever to limit the construction of these dry-docks at the public expense to places where there is no business demand for them. It is a very serious proposition for this House to entertain. We are very often particular about the small amounts paid to our own employees in the Senate. We try to save money in various ways, on stationery and so on, and here is a proposition which may involve the absolute throwing away of millions of dollars, and we are not really supposed to have any opinion about it.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I call my hon. friend's attention to subclause 2 of clause 3, by which a responsibility is placed on the government, that they must obtain evidence that the thing is needed in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Based on the report of the chief engineer.

Hon. Mr. POWER—With respect to that, I can fancy that the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works and the minister would be likely to think that the public interest called for the construction of a dry-dock in a place where no business concern would ever think of locating it. I think this is an exceedingly extravagant and unbusinesslike proceeding, and I simply wish to make my protest.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has but a few places in his mind. He would not object to Halifax having a dry-dock.

Hon. Mr. POWER—There is one there already.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Yes, and it needs to be enlarged, and I think the first provisions of the Act are just to meet such a case as Halifax. It seems to me there is enough shipping done, and the importance of that port is perhaps enough, to turn the