

in the vicinity and they scooped it out and made a harbour of it, much to their glory. But we are not talking about that sort of thing but of the importance of improving the natural harbours we have, and it is no use my hon. friend comparing conditions in Liverpool and London, in a very small country where there are about 50,000,000 people and the oldest commercial establishments in the world, with a country of the vast area and distances of Canada with only eight millions of people. Great Britain is an old country and Canada is new. Their resources and trade are developed; ours are not. We have to deal with primitive conditions and I think we are doing splendidly along international lines, and in that respect I intend to encourage the people of this country.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I reply to one specific point raised by the hon. member? I regret to occupy so much time of the Committee. In so far as the geography and the various characteristics of Nova Scotia are concerned, I confess my lack of knowledge and am prepared to sit at the feet of the hon. gentleman and be instructed by him. With regard to what is known as the McMaster resolution introduced at this session, the hon. member says I need to explain to my people squarely why I voted in a certain way. Well, I will explain to him squarely now why I did. I explained at the time I voted against the McMaster resolution that I did so for exactly the same reason that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and I both voted against similar resolutions under the guidance of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's when our party was in power and when such resolutions were raised on going into Supply instead of on the Budget at the proper time. I did that under the Liberal Government with my hon. friend, and it will be he who will have to explain how what I did under the Liberal Government was quite right but what I did under the Unionist Government was utterly wrong.

Mr. MAHARG: I should like some information as to the internal management of our own harbours. Is it the intention that the grain elevators at the port of Vancouver will be under the management of the harbour commissioners there?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is.

Mr. MAHARG: We have been told of the success of the Montreal harbour from the standpoint of management, and we have

also been told about its finances, and while we have not been told that it has not been a success in the matter of facilities, I know there is considerable difficulty in that respect. If I am correctly informed, the net receipts from the grain terminal elevator in the harbour of Montreal takes care of almost the entire cost of management of that harbour. If they are charging the same rates as obtain in the other terminal elevators, they are receiving in the neighbourhood of from \$350,000,000 to \$500,000,000 of revenue from that harbour, depending on the amount of business done there. We are given to understand that the receipts from the handling of the western grain take charge of the entire expense almost of Montreal harbour.

The minister shakes his head. Evidently he thinks that is not so, but I think that a close analysis of the work of the harbour under men in a position to know where the overhead expenditure is placed in the management of the harbour will go to show that what I say is approximately correct. Now, this harbour of Montreal is in a different position. We were given to understand when the National Transcontinental railway was built that the harbour of Montreal and the harbour of Quebec were going to be put in a position of handling the immense quantities of grain from the West. We were given to understand, and I think properly so, that the rates for carrying grain from the head of the lakes to Quebec would be considerably reduced, even all-rail rates, on account of the shortness of the distance. There seems to have been absolutely nothing done in connection with the improvement of the facilities at Quebec to take care of that grain. Evidently the grain does not go that way and there may be the explanation that it cannot be handled as cheaply by that route. But if it can be I think it should be, and that the National Transcontinental Railway should be given every advantage that can be given to it to carry grain over that route if it can be done at the same rate as by the lake and rail route. I would like an explanation as to why there has been no more business handled through the port of Quebec, and why it should not get a share of the revenue received at Montreal from the handling of western grain.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) I wish to inform him that he has not obtained accurate information as to the sources of revenue collected at the ports of Montreal or Quebec. I will speak first of