

Quebec Harbour Commissioners

Architectural branch—salaries of architects, clerks of works, inspectors, draftsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, \$73,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the particulars of this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is the usual item for that service, except that there is a reduction of \$4,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Any resignations there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. Three positions have been abolished, amounting to a total of \$6,960, and then there is an adjustment of salaries. The statutory increases amounted to \$1,140.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much has been put in for retirements or has anything been done in connection with retirements or pensions?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I gave that information some nights ago when I discussed the civil government list. That has been all tabled by this department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether that was in this list or not.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not, so far as this vote is concerned.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Has the item carried, Mr. Chairman?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think, Mr. Chairman you could really respect the minister when he is on his feet trying his best to give us the information. Of course we are accustomed to that sort of thing here, but in the case of the minister may I appeal to my hon. friend to be considerate? But seriously, how can we tell how much of those retirements and pensions which are shown in your general list is attributable to this vote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are three of the positions abolished which we show as being attributable to this vote.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the third reading of Bill No. 160, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, when this bill came up for second [Mr. J. H. King.]

reading, it was brought on at a very late hour, and I did not at that time have an opportunity of expressing an opinion which I feel in duty bound to express. I, therefore, avail myself of this opportunity of expressing that opinion, and I will assure the House that I will not take many minutes to do it. Hon. members from this side of the House have been pressing to obtain some information as to the need for this vast expenditure of money, and they also have endeavoured to find out from the minister how the money is to be spent. So far the information given has been very meagre, and we have not been able to secure any intimation as to whether this \$5,000,000 is to build docks, drydocks, wharves, flour mills, terminal elevators, or whatever it is to be devoted to. I frankly state that if I had been asking this House for a paltry \$100 to fence in that huge hole in the street of Calgary which we have in lieu of a post office, I would have been ashamed if I could not have given a better account of what the money was required for than all the information that has been given in regard to this huge vote. If the government and those supporting this vote have failed to give us the required information, it has been very clearly shown that at the present time there is not enough traffic to warrant this expenditure and that there are ample facilities at Quebec now to take care of all the traffic and business that the port affords. The government argue that facilities should be provided. They say: Only give us the facilities and let us trust to luck for the trade. If we were to start to build a \$5,000,000 elevator at Banff in the centre of the mountains and say: Some day we shall have a shipping outlet to the coast there; only give us the facilities, it would be almost as reasonable as what the government is asking us to do in this case. There is no evidence that in the near future there will be sufficient development of trade from this port to warrant parliament to vote \$5,000,000 to Quebec at this time. This policy, it appears to me, under the conditions that we are facing financially and from a business point of view at the present time is sheer madness. What is the actual situation? The Montreal interests are the chief competitors with Quebec in the shipping business. We are called upon from time to time to spend millions of dollars to dredge the St. Lawrence in order to enable ships to come up to Montreal. Now we are asked to spend \$5,000,000 to keep the ships down at Quebec. I have no doubt that Montreal will win ultimately in this competition. It would appear that