

do. We consulted the provinces in order to give them an opportunity to indicate whether the statute would be an encroachment upon their rights.

Mr. RALSTON: But there is no difference between them.

Mr. DUPRE: Now, the third point is with regard to shipping. At present our shipping legislation is the same throughout the empire. After the adoption of the statute which we are now debating, each dominion will be enabled to enact its own legislation with respect to shipping. I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the report, part 1, of the Imperial conference of 1930, with regard to the draft agreement as to British commonwealth merchant shipping. This will be found at page 30 of the report. Part 4 relates to equal treatment, and contains three articles—10, 11 and 12. Article 10 reads:

Each part of the British commonwealth agrees to grant access to its ports to all ships registered in the British commonwealth on equal terms and undertakes that no laws or regulations relating to seagong ships at any time in force in that part shall apply more favourably to ships registered in that part, or to the ships of any foreign country, than they apply to any ship registered in any other part of the commonwealth.

The object of this agreement is to preserve the necessary uniformity, to maintain the common status of British ships, and to ensure cooperation among all parts of the empire in shipping matters. Article 11, dealing with the same points, provides:

While each part of the British commonwealth may regulate its own coasting trade, it is agreed that any laws or regulations from time to time in force for that purpose shall treat all ships registered in the British commonwealth in exactly the same manner as ships registered in that part, and not less favourably in any respect than ships of any foreign country.

In other words, Canadian ships would have the same status in Ireland or South Africa or Australia as the ships of these dominions will have in our waters. But the important part for us is article 12, which reads:

Nothing in the present agreement shall be deemed—

(i) to derogate from the right of every part of the commonwealth to impose customs tariff duties on ships built outside that part; or

(ii) to restrict the right of the government of each part of the commonwealth to give financial assistance to ships registered in that part or its right to regulate the sea fisheries of that part.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was recommended by the conference of 1929.

Mr. DUPRE: Yes, I admit that. But it required the passing of the present statute in

order to give effect to the present draft agreement to which I am referring. What I am pointing out is that with the passing of the proposed statute there will come a day, at least I hope so, when Canada, having the right to impose customs tariff duties on ships built outside the Dominion of Canada, will be able to encourage the shipbuilding industry of this country. At the present time very many ships are built abroad which could be built in our country. We have in the province of Quebec shipyards and workmen, and I submit that as soon as the statute is passed we should see to it that our shipyards and our shipbuilders are provided with work, thereby giving employment to our own workmen.

Just a few words now before closing. I observe a difference of opinion between the ex-Minister of Justice and Premier Taschereau with respect to the interpretation of clause 66 of the report of the Imperial conference of 1926. This afternoon I also heard the ex-Minister of Justice declaring himself to be against appeals to the privy council. I was thinking then of a session of the legislature of Quebec three or four years ago when a personal friend of the ex-Minister of Justice, a good Liberal like himself, the Hon. Mr. Theriault, then member for L'Islet, and now a member of the legislative council, rose with a motion to abolish appeals to the privy council. The opponent of Mr. Theriault was not a Tory, but the premier of the province of Quebec, the Hon. L. A. Taschereau himself. Mr. Taschereau then took exactly the opposite view to that taken by the ex-Minister of Justice. Of course there must be two schools of Liberalism: the school of federal Liberalism and the school of provincial Liberalism. It is a sort of combine and it works according to the chances they can have in either the provincial or the federal field.

I noticed when the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) was closing his remarks, he complimented the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). For this I thank him. I also compliment my hon. friend on the address which he delivered this afternoon. It shows for one thing, that contrary to what has been said by my hon. friends to the left of the Speaker, the Imperial conference was not after all such a fiasco or failure. If we were enabled to do what we were complimented this afternoon on doing, then the conference certainly led to something. I remember before the last election we were told that we could not go to the Imperial conference; that the only competent persons to go were the hon. members sitting on the Liberal side. When we returned from