

ports are managed and shipping is developed in Britain, and of the methods which I understand both of these hon. gentlemen to recommend.

The position is a very simple one. The leader of the Opposition knows, of course, that, to put it mildly, there is considerable shipping done in the port of Liverpool. I suppose it is, perhaps, the biggest shipping port in the world. Now, when one goes out of that beautiful harbour of Bedford Basin, as I have done more than once, on the beauties of which the leader of the Opposition is prepared to expatiate at any given moment, one cannot but be struck by the dearth of ships in Bedford Basin as compared with the plentifulness of ships in the port of Liverpool. The contrast is most striking to an observant traveller. The port of Liverpool has grown up as a free port, as I understand free ports. It has grown up under a system of free importation and free exportation—under a system of free trade. The want of trade in Bedford Basin, I think, can be traced to an opposite fiscal policy. I understand that the leader of the Opposition's idea of a free port is a port to which all the nations of the world would be allowed to send their ships, provided they could get their goods over the tariff wall that is now preventing the admission of the goods. I want to tell my hon. friend that he may spend as much money from Ottawa as he likes to make Bedford Basin ten times more beautiful and effective as a harbour than it is to-day, but if he keeps his tariff wall high enough the shipping will not come, because commerce will not be profitable.

My idea of a free port is not a port in which ships do not pay dues. The ships that come to Liverpool harbour, of course, pay their dues to the Harbour and Dock Commissioners, and the Harbour and Dock Commissioners of Liverpool conduct the port where the greatest shipping in the world is done. My idea of a free port is a port where goods come in and go out freely, and on that free method of business will grow up a trade under which the ships will be only too glad, because of the profits they make by their ships, to pay any dues that come against them, and the central government will, of course, avoid responsibility for expenditure which is very much calculated to be altogether unproductive.

I am not opposed to spending money on the harbour at Vancouver. It is an equally beautiful port, and has every possibility of doing a world business. I, of all men, should be the last to be suspected of being opposed to the expenditure of money on

the port of Vancouver, but what I want is a fiscal policy which will make Vancouver another Liverpool, and I do not think that the hon. member for Vancouver will be opposed to that ambition for his city, whether or not he quite agrees with me as to the method of doing it.

I want to reason with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I address him in the language of Scripture, if he will allow me to do so, "Come let us reason together" upon this question. Why the other Friday evening, before my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) had resigned the portfolio of Agriculture, and was getting through his estimates, there was some talk about cold storage facilities, and the leader of the Opposition made a speech to which I listened with interest and some degree of wonder, in which he showed that a million dollars could be most profitably spent by this Government in establishing a cold storage plant at the port of Halifax. Does my hon. friend think that there are no cold storage facilities at the port of Liverpool? Liverpool has abundant cold storage facilities, provided by the harbour and dock commissioners of Liverpool, and paid out of the shipping of the port. That is my idea of a free port. I put this to my hon. friend, who has a good head for business: If this Government is going to spend a million dollars upon a cold storage plant, is going to spend \$5,000,000 upon harbour improvements elsewhere, and is going to go on handing out millions, how is he going to carry out the policy of economy for which he voted the night before last, and where are we going to land if we launch into all these expenditures without making our fiscal arrangements so that we can do business to meet the expenditure in the only way it can be met. If my hon. friend was at all annoyed by the expression "antediluvian views," I withdraw it.

I applied it to his views, and I still hold that if those views are not quite antediluvian they are pretty ancient at this time of day, and when my hon. friend studies the question he will find that he lacks the current knowledge of men who have moved around the world and studied shipping. I tell him that in all friendliness because I want to get him on my side and he has been coming along splendidly. He says: I find this free trade protection question in everything I approach. Surely my hon. friend does not think that the fiscal policy of a country has not anything to do with its shipping. He would not take that position. What is the good of his bringing in a