

cerned in the enlargement and regeneration of the west end of the harbour. The old wharfs there were found to be totally insufficient, while the wharfs in the east end, which I have mentioned, being new wharfs, were built on an intelligent plan. The old wharfs project at right angles into the current making it difficult to enter and get out. The old wharfs at the west end of the city require to be rebuilt and remodelled. When that is done, there will not be more wharfage accommodation there than there is now, and nothing like the wharfage accommodation there is at the east end. But this question of east and west end is a false way of looking at it, a way which I, for one, have no sympathy with. I repeat what I said a moment ago, if the business requires it, I for one will be delighted to see the works extended to the east end if there is a justification for it. What does this bill profess to do? It professes to give the security of the government to the harbour commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of having the work carried on at a cheaper rate of interest. That costs the government nothing. The last loan which was effected by the government was at something under three per cent, now, they propose to lend this money at three. The proposition on the face of it is a fair one. It costs the government nothing, but when a large portion of this sum is required by the Act to be spent in a manner which is not profitable, the want of which is not felt, which is not asked by the shipping interests or by the merchants, you are putting us in this position: you have the government acting very much like the old money lenders who would professedly give you a loan of money on reasonable terms, but stipulate that you take a large proportion of it in pictures or jewellery for which you have no use. The position of the government is accurately enough given in a couplet in *Hudibras*. Speaking of a local magnate, it is recorded of him:

That out of his great bounty,
He built a bridge at the expense of the county.

Now, if the government came down with a proposition to build a dry dock in Montreal for the general benefit of the Dominion, or the ships trading at the port of Montreal, at their own expense, I for one, should hail it as an act of tardy justice. It has been done elsewhere and will be done elsewhere in the future. Why not at Montreal?

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHUE—The one at Esquimaux was built by a contribution by the English government and a proportion by Canada.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—My argument is this: what is a dry dock for? It is for the purpose of repairing a vessel which may be damaged, or want her bottom cleaned, or some other things. It concerns the shipping companies, not the men handling the goods, not the merchants sending oats and wheat and breadstuffs out.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Does it not make the port of Montreal very popular with the shipping interests to have one?

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—That question could be better answered by the owners of shipping than by myself. There is a very important difference, let me assure the hon. gentleman. The very men whose ships are to be benefited by the construction of this dock do not ask for it. Surely they know their business better than you and I do.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—I do not think it.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—I speak as a man handling goods. To make the cost of the construction of this dock an additional charge on Montreal will add to the price of carrying goods by Montreal, and add to the cost of exporting every bushel of grain that goes out of Montreal. I therefore oppose it. Now, the general conception of Montreal and its interest is that the enormous wealth, the enormous incomes, etc., of the city can well stand a little squeezing, and that they are not entitled to the consideration that is given to feebler communities. I should like to deal with that question for a moment. Is it the fact that from its position, from its geographical advantages or what, Montreal has such an advantage that it can afford to bear the pressure of additional taxation which other places are exempt from? I say no, it is not. At this very minute it costs us very nearly as much to import goods direct to Montreal as it does to bring them into Montreal by Atlantic seaports. The fact is that the long course of almost inland navigation from the gulf adds to the marine insurance. The marine insurance to Montreal from Europe is very nearly double what it is to Boston. The rates of freight, in consequence of the bigger business and a systematic business, summer