

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Oh, yes. I may say that the discussion will probably take place on the details of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. ROCHE: I think it is agreed on all hands that this is a money Bill. The object of submitting it to a committee is to amend or alter it. It is the function of the House of Commons to make all grants of money to the King. There is no doubt that this is an aid to the King. Why should we interfere with the undoubted prerogative of the House of Commons? We should be setting a bad precedent which might lead to a conflict with the House of Commons. I think the line is very clearly drawn that the Senate shall not interfere with money Bills either to amend or to negative them. The House of Commons has the right to alter such Bills, but we have no right, and I would oppose the motion to commit the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: We are only following the usual course adopted with reference to all Bills. If the House is of the same opinion as my honourable friend from Halifax, that we should allow the Bill to go through as it is, I would not object to taking the third reading to-day.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

SHIPMENT VIA CANADIAN PORTS.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

The Senate resume from August 28 the adjourned debate on the inquiry of Hon. Mr. L'Espérance:

To call to the attention of the Senate to the fact that our tidewater ports are now properly equipped for the storage and speedy handling of grain and other merchandise, and to urge that the exportation of our products by the allied government buyers should be routed through our Canadian ports as far as possible, and to inquire if it is the intention of the Government to take any action to prevent in future the bulk of the export of the oceanic traffic being routed via American ports.

Hon. P. A. CHOQUETTE: Honourable gentlemen, I was unfortunately absent from the House when the honourable gentleman from the Gulf division (Hon. Mr. L'Espérance) brought up this important question of the tidewater ports; but I have read with pleasure and interest, not only the speech of the honourable gentleman himself, but also the remarks made by the seconder of the resolution, the honourable gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Nicholls), who spoke a good word for Quebec, the remarks made by the honourable gentleman from De Lanaudière, (Hon. Mr. Casgrain), and

those of the honourable gentleman from Rideau (Hon. Mr. Edwards). I am sorry to have to disagree with the statement in the motion of the honourable gentleman from the Gulf division that "the tidewater ports are now properly equipped for the storage and speedy handling of grain and other merchandise," etc. I think this statement is incorrect and is, moreover, misleading. It has misled even the honourable the junior member for Halifax (Hon. Mr. Crosby), who said in his address:

The honourable gentleman states that the port of Quebec is now equipped with terminal facilities sufficient for all the export from this Dominion across the Atlantic.

So I say that the remarks made by the honourable gentleman from the Gulf division were not only inaccurate, but very misleading. I have taken the trouble to obtain some information from the Quebec Board of Trade and the Mayor of Quebec in order to correct that statement, so that later on we may not be reproached for having said that we wanted nothing more for the port of Quebec, because we had all that we required. So it is most important at this time to place the facts before this honourable House and show the necessity of improving and continuing to improve not only the port of Quebec but all Canadian ports.

I understand from the remarks made by the mover of the resolution that, in introducing this question, he had two different points of view: first, that of the necessity and importance of the matter; and, secondly, that stated in the following remarks, which he made at the close of the address:

If my feeble words and deeds may contribute in the slightest degree to the realization of this great dream of mine, I shall be amply compensated for the harsh and unjust criticisms which some of my public acts have brought upon my head.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the only excuse for that statement by the honourable gentleman was the vote which he gave in this House recently on the question of conscription; because, from his past declarations, not only in the elections of 1911, but since then, we all know that he was opposed to conscription. Of course, he had the right to change his mind; I have nothing to say against that; but there is no doubt that his change of mind has brought upon him the harsh criticisms of his conduct—which are, I may say, not unjust, but fair. At all events, in order to show my good fellowship towards him, I am quite willing to overlook that and consider only the interest he has in the