

the opportunity it should have and if the railways will give a reasonable rate from the western prairies to the port of Quebec, some day this should be considered as really an investment. I know my hon. friends want to be fair, but the other night some statements were made that were far outside the mark and I am pleased to have been given an opportunity of correcting them.

Mr. COOTE: What are the receipts from the dry dock at Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Champlain dry dock during the year ended March 31, 1925, collected in dockage dues from vessels that entered the dock \$38,356. During the year ended March 31, 1924, the dockage dues collected amounted to \$59,881.11. During the year ended March 31, 1925, in the other dry dock the dues amounted to \$22,376, and in 1924, to \$19,706.

Mr. COOTE: Has the minister the cost of the drydocks at Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. Those were built by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Do I understand the minister to say that Canadian capital is being provided to secure storage facilities at Buffalo?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. I merely read a letter addressed by Mr. J. G. Scott to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke).

Mr. LUCAS: Are any vessels held up at Quebec now for lack of docking facilities there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I could not say whether there is one to-night, but I know all the facilities are in use.

Mr. GARDINER: What are the rentals received from the wharves at Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think that appears in the report of the harbour commission. I have not the information here. It was given the other night in the debate on the resolution.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: In any remarks that I am going to make on this bill to-night, I want it to be thoroughly understood that my sentiments are with the province of Quebec in more ways than one. I was born in that wonderful province; I have a good many relations living in that province to-day, and my sympathies are with it. But until I am convinced that this vote is absolutely necessary and essential, I am going to vote against it, not because I am antagonistic to Quebec, be-

[Mr Lapointe.]

cause, as I said before, my sympathies are with that province. I do not agree with the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) that we are ever going to ship grain to Quebec in any quantity. The hon. member said the other night that if we got a reduction in rates on the National railways, we would ship a great deal of grain to Quebec. I do not agree with him for these reasons. If we have an ordinary crop in western Canada to-day, it takes all that our railways can do to transport our products to Fort William and Port Arthur. If we are going to ship grain to Quebec—and I would like to see that just as much as any other hon. member and to see our Canadian ports being used—we are going to add between one thousand and eleven hundred miles of railway haul for our grain. What will that mean? It will mean an additional expenditure in providing rolling stock, and at least 80 per cent of the cars that will haul that grain to Quebec will have to go back west empty. That is happening to-day at Fort William and Port Arthur. Hundreds of cars are going back empty into western Canada that have been loaded with grain going into Port Arthur. I agree that the idea which Sir Wilfrid Laurier had in mind when the National Transcontinental was built was to ship grain direct to Quebec and make use of that port to a considerable extent. But the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier have passed and we have the port of Vancouver at the present time with its possibilities. When Sir Wilfrid undertook to build the Transcontinental he did not foresee the future of the port of Vancouver nor the development of the Panama canal traffic. I say in all sincerity that you will never be able to haul grain in any large quantity to the port of Quebec or to Halifax or St. John; the grain will go where there are the cheapest facilities, and one half cent a bushel of a difference will divert the whole grain traffic to the more favourable ports.

I am quite sympathetic with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe); and as a matter of fact there is not an hon. member in this part of the House who does not sympathize with him in this matter. I know that those of us in this group who have expressed views adverse to this expenditure have been charged with being antagonistic to Quebec. But I hope that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) will think that of me; I hope they will not entertain any such opinion of any member in this group. I must say however that expenditures at the present time, whether they