

Port.	Sea-going tonnage.
Victoria..	2,695,987
Montreal..	2,689,171
Halifax..	2,054,406
Vancouver..	2,045,243
St. John..	1,859,157
Quebec..	1,788,872

Thus Victoria has a tonnage 7,000 tons greater than that of Montreal and 800,000 tons greater than that of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the tonnage of vessels or the tonnage of merchandise?

Mr. BARNARD. That is the tonnage of vessels.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the daily passenger steamers.

Mr. BARNARD. I wish to be quite fair with the committee. I do not mean to contend that the city of Victoria compares with Montreal or Quebec or Halifax, in the amount of freight it handles, but I do say that the figures I have quoted are sufficient to show that both Victoria and Vancouver are cities of such importance in commerce that the Dominion government has no longer any right to ignore them in questions of national expenditure.

The tonnage I have quoted deals altogether with sea-going vessels. The figures in connection with the coasting trade are somewhat different. These figures are:

Port.	No. of Vessels.	Tonnage.
Montreal....	8,111	3,901,000
Quebec..	1,654	2,628,136
Victoria..	4,953	1,525,445
Vancouver..	8,522	1,324,714
Halifax..	2,362	1,147,367
St. John..	1,866	980,173

I am prepared to admit that St. John ships much more freight than either Victoria or Vancouver, but these figures are sufficient to show to any reasonable person that the ports of Victoria and Vancouver are just as deserving of consideration, notwithstanding the fact that they are in the little province of British Columbia—little in point of votes but big in area and importance—as are some of the ports in the maritime and other eastern provinces.

Again I would like to contrast, for the benefit of the committee, some of the expenditures in these ports for harbour works. The figures I am about to quote I have taken not from the blue-books, but from the Vancouver 'Province,' which quotes them as coming from the Ottawa 'Free Press,' a newspaper not unfavourable to the administration. This paper gives the figures from 1899 to 1908. I shall not weary the committee with the details but shall give the totals as follows: In the ports of Montreal and Quebec, Port Arthur, Fort William, Depot Harbour, Midland, Port Col-

Mr. BARNARD.

borne, Kingston, Sydney, N.S., St. John harbour only and Halifax, there has been since 1899 an expenditure of \$7,396,446. In the ports of Victoria and Vancouver, in the same length of time, there has been expended the magnificent sum of \$256,178. I say that in all fairness, political affinities altogether on one side, the administration should make some appropriation not only for Victoria but also for Vancouver. Ocean steamship lines ply between there and Mexico, Australia, China, and California. In addition to these we have the China Mutual steamers coming in from Great Britain, we have tramp freight ships and we have also all the trade north to the Yukon and the northern ports of British Columbia. I plead for justice for the people of British Columbia. When you see \$7,000,000 spent in ten years on the eastern ports and \$250,000 in British Columbia, it is not surprising that such contrasts make the people of that province think that their position, so far as federal expenditure goes, is almost intolerable. When one sees an expenditure of \$600,000 deliberately voted by this committee for the improvement of some rapids to connect a lake with the city of Winnipeg, where there is no shipping except an occasional prairie schooner, I submit that it is a most unreasonable expenditure. Unless the government can better regulate their expenditure they had better put the matter into the hands of somebody else.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am a little surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria regarding the improvements at St. Andrew's rapids. I concur in what the minister says about the necessity of that work. It is of great necessity and is going to accomplish great good, not only for the city of Winnipeg, but for the town of Selkirk and the lake trade. I commend the expense, but I plead with the minister to complete the bridge. That bridge is in a locality where the municipalities are very poor and are absolutely unable to complete it. If the government does not complete it, it will lie there, and the money the government has expended on it will be wasted. I have been advised that it will take \$75,000 to put in these two approaches. That is a sum away beyond the ability of these municipalities to contribute. During the campaign all the people along that river were led to believe that they were going to get that bridge, and I would ask the minister to try to arrange to complete it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to give him a hint that may be useful? In the province of New Brunswick the provincial government has built scores of steel bridges without calling on the federal government to contribute a cent. In Manitoba the provincial govern-