

that is that the government have not adopted that recommendation of the Transportation Commission. It has not nationalized either of these ports or any other ports. Montreal has not received any money from the government in the direction of the nationalization of that port. Neither has Quebec. I will admit that the machinery recently provided by the government for the administration of the harbour of Montreal is undoubtedly an improvement upon the old one. But it is an old system. It is not a new system. It is not an ideal system, as my hon. friend from Beauharis (Mr. Bergeron) says, and it is not the new system that is recommended. I take then some of these improvements in harbours and rivers, not only in Quebec, but in the other provinces. No doubt there are urgent calls everywhere, but why cannot we declare, in the first place, that we adopt that recommendation; that we adopt that report, as we do all the other reports, even the most trivial, that are made to this government, and set aside every year a certain amount for the carrying out of the report, instead of laying that report entirely aside and pursuing the system we have pursued for years? In 1903 the pretext for naming this commission was precisely that we wanted to adopt a proper system of transportation in Canada, and that we meant to carry it out. My hon. friend has taken very great care to avoid saying that the government proposed to adopt the policy recommended by the Transportation Commission. You never can get the government to say of that report: We adopt it or we reject it. If they do something which happens to be included in the recommendations of the Transportation Commission they say: You see that we are carrying out that report; but the system of transportation and the equipment of our ports which they recommend have not been carried out. My hon. friend has pointed out that some works were executed on the Kaministiquia river. Yes; there have been some improvements there, some dredging; but that is not what the Transportation Commission recommended. They say that as that is the head of Canadian navigation, you must immediately nationalize the ports of Port Arthur and Fort William, just as you must nationalize the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax; that the land there must be immediately taken possession of by the government while it is cheap and easily available, and that certain works must be executed immediately. Nothing of that kind has been done any more than has been done in Montreal. It seems to me that when we vote millions every year, as we do here, it is competent for members of this House, instead of criticising every item individually, to direct the attention of the government to this report, which has been pre-

pared by competent men, and to ask what you are going to do about it. Are you going to carry it out, or are you going to continue the old system?

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that what my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said is perfectly in order and to the point, and that the best way to reply to the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) would be to read to him 'Hansard' between the years 1879 and 1896.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, do not do that.

Mr. BERGERON. During the time the Conservative party were in power all these items appeared in the estimates, and year after year we read the very same names. You would imagine that it was a perpetual payment that is expected every year by the places which are mentioned. The hon. gentlemen opposite, when they sat here—and they may have been right—declared that this money was being spent for nothing, that it was a corrupt expenditure, and that this was the way which had been adopted of buying up counties. The hon. acting minister answers our criticism by saying that these recommendations are not made by members of parliament. No; but members of parliament are pressed by their electors. We were promised, in 1896, that if there was a change of government there would be a change of methods. But the methods have not been changed. Hon. gentlemen are in a better position than we were before 1896 by reason of the report of this commission. They can answer to these people who are clamouring for these little bits of work: We have appointed a commission and we are only going to carry out the report of the commission. But my hon. friend goes further than that. He is ready to accept the proposition of the commission, he is ready to make further large expenditures which it proposes, and which I think may be right. I believe that no amount of money should be spared to put the ports of Halifax and St. John in proper shape. I believe that any amount of money spent in Montreal would be well spent, and, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says, instead of squandering over three-quarters of a million in little bits of wharfs and pieces of work right and left, if that money were spent upon the ports of Halifax and Montreal, or any other national harbour in Canada, it would be more advantageous to the country. As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says, and as the hon. acting minister knows, there must be an end to this. We know what it means; it means that if the minister does not give the people of such and such a county a little bit of work he may lose a few votes. But the people must be educated upon