

this corporation will be endowed with a very large amount of wealth. I do not say that it is not advisable that it should be. But if it is to be endowed with public property yielding a very large revenue, I think it would be well to place upon it some obligation. I appreciate the fact that this corporation will have to expend a good deal of money in the way of developing the harbour; but it will be advisable not to leave that to the sole discretion of the corporation, but to have incorporated in the law the works they propose to build. Of course, we must have wharfs and sheds, and so on. There is no doubt in my opinion at all events, that Vancouver is going to be the great harbour of the Pacific ocean, perhaps greater even than San Francisco. Pending the completion of the Panama canal, it is impossible to calculate the amount of traffic that will originate at Vancouver. There is no doubt that in a very few years this corporation will have to spend millions of dollars in developing that harbour, and it is desirable that we should have all the data before us.

Mr. HAZEN: I was pointing out before my right hon. friend came into the House that the annual tonnage coming to the port of Vancouver is approximately 10,000,000 tons, an enormous amount considering the very limited facilities there are for doing business there. I also mentioned what my right hon. friend has mentioned, that the prospects for a tremendous development in the future are undoubted, especially in view of the completion of the Panama canal. My right hon. friend has suggested that there should be some safeguards put in the Bill. I would call his attention to the fact that there is a clause which vests the title to the foreshore in the harbour commissioners. It was thought desirable in drafting the Bill that that foreshore should be available for the purpose of the harbour. It seemed to be a fair proposition that as it has been the practice in the past for the Government to grant foreshores for public purposes for really nominal considerations, in the case of a great harbour like this where the foreshore is very much a part of the harbour it should be made available for the purposes of the harbour, and that the revenues derived should go to its maintenance and development. But the clause vesting the title to the foreshore in the commissioners, is subject to this: It is to be held subject to any lease or privilege already granted, and subject also to riparian rights, and the Government may at any time after each recurring five years repossess itself of the property. That is, the Government may take possession of the property at any time it is thought desirable to do so, if it is not being used in the public interest, or for other reasons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

It was thought desirable in view of the great increase in the values, and in the revenue which may occur in the years to come, that all dealings in the land by the commissioners should be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. That is to say, the commissioners cannot divest themselves of the foreshore; they cannot sell it, and they cannot lease it except under conditions. The Governor in Council ensures that a lease will never be granted except on a proper rental being obtained. The revenue which the Government at present obtains from the harbour of Vancouver is managed like that of any other harbour; that is, under the Harbour Masters' Act, it is managed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The amount now received from the harbour in harbour dues is \$866.50; from the port warden, \$850; from leases of water lots, \$6,671.95; and from the shipping masters, \$1,959.40, making a total of \$10,317.85. These are the figures as they were made up a few months ago, but since then other leases of the foreshore have been granted which would bring the amount up to a larger figure, to probably \$12,000 or \$13,000. Of course, this amount would materially assist the board to get started, pending the completion of any of the works which it is proposed to erect, and which would not be revenue producers until they were built. The policy which I have been trying to adopt with regard to foreshore leases, and I have found some difficulty in the matter, as I have never been quite satisfied with it, is as far as possible to refuse to give grants of any foreshores, and to insist on rentals. I find from the terms of the leases granted under the former Government that they were for a period of twenty-one years with a provision for renewal for another twenty-one years and for a third renewal of twenty-one years at same rental. I have obtained the authority of council to insert in the Bill a provision for the readjustment of the rent. At the end of each period of 21 years the amount of increased rent to be paid shall then be fixed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if that amount is not satisfactory to the lessees, then it shall be determined by a judge of the Exchequer Court. There is a difficulty in ascertaining what a fair amount would be at which these foreshores should be rented. There was a policy which was pretty generally observed in the department by which the water front was valued at \$10 a foot. If the foreshore had a frontage of 100 feet, that valuation would be \$1,000, and then there was charged on that valuation an annual rental of five per cent, which would be \$50. It seemed to me that however adequate that might have been in the past, it was hardly satis-