

free port. We are building a magnificent pier at Quebec to afford accommodation for large ocean steamers. On the great lakes also, in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we are developing the harbours of Victoria and Tiffin, so as to afford accommodation for large steamers; and I am happy to say that we are dredging those harbours so rapidly that we expect by the 1st of October to make it possible for large steamers to come right up to the elevators which those two railway companies are building. I believe the result of this will be to build up a new Buffalo at each of these places, and thus to draw away from Buffalo, New York, Baltimore and Portland millions of bushels of grain that now find their outlet by these American ports. At Port Arthur and Fort William we are carrying out the same large national idea, deepening the harbours in order to give ample accommodation for the large lake vessels that go there. This is our policy from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if we have not in words carried out the policy enunciated by the Transportation Commission, we are in fact carrying it out as rapidly as we can, consistently with the resources of the country.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to allow the statement of my hon. friend to go entirely unchallenged. I for my part am impressed with the idea that he has not recently read the report of the Transportation Commission, for its suggestions are not being carried out in the spirit any more than in the letter. We were advised by the Transportation Commission to do something without delay to establish national ports on the Pacific coast, at Victoria, Vancouver and even Prince Rupert, if I remember rightly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do national ports necessarily mean free ports?

Mr. MONK. Unquestionably. If there was any doubt about that, that doubt was set at rest by the Transportation Commission stating in so many words that they should be free ports. What have we done at Fort William and Port Arthur? We were advised to set aside without a moment's delay a certain space along the waterfront and construct shipping facilities in that space; but we have not done so. We have instead instituted a Harbour Commission there, which was exactly what the Transportation Commission did not suggest. What we have done at this end of the great lakes I will not take time to dilate upon. But take the port of Montreal. At present we have arriving there large steamers laden with grain. It is the beginning of an immense grain trade at Montreal, which we have not had so far because of the lack of facilities. A steamer carrying 90,000 bushels of grain arriving in Montreal takes nine hours to discharge its cargo, while other vessels are waiting, be-

Mr. PUGSLEY.

cause our grain elevator there has only one leg. It ought to have at least eight or ten additional legs, which could be built at a cost of from \$30,000 to \$60,000 each. Go to Duluth and Superior, and see how the discharging of vessels is done there. Although this matter has been referred to time and again, the government has continued deaf to this necessity in the port of Montreal, while they squander money on wharfs which in many cases are not asked for, or are asked for by members simply for some private reason. What are the government doing in regard to constructing the Georgian Bay canal? Mr. Reford deemed that work to be of such importance that he supplemented the report of the Transportation Commission with another report in which he said that the developments recently taking place in the United States rendered it absolutely imperative that we should without any further delay proceed with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

My hon. friend speaks of obliging certain localities. Well, there is a public work twice recommended by that commission which will benefit many localities. It will benefit not only Montreal but the whole country; and if the money we are spending uselessly on works, with the sole object of gaining political advantage, were not spent, there would be enough to pay the annual interest on the cost of the Georgian Bay canal. It is high time that we should leave out politics in the selection of public works to be done and master this transportation problem, instead of squandering money on works that may be of some use here and there but that are by no means urgent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the port of Montreal, my hon. friend does not do justice to the Harbour Commissioners who are carrying on so successfully the great work of developing that port.

Mr. MONK. They are doing it very well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are doing it so well that not long ago, quite a note of alarm was sounded from New York at the way the port of Montreal is drawing trade from that city. I believe the commission will continue to do good work, and the government can be reasonably generous in furnishing the necessary funds. It is all very well to accuse this government of squandering money on wharfs; but instead of making a general statement, it would be better to point out on what particular wharfs the money is being squandered.

Mr. MONK. I know that is a very disagreeable task and exposes one to very unfair attack. But I have no hesitation to point them out if forced into that position. Take my own province, there are very extensive works going on at St. Johns. I believe that the government are there doing works which largely, if not entirely, should