

clearly. In 1927 the discussion arose upon addresses which had been delivered by right hon. gentlemen opposite. One was by the right hon. the Prime Minister of that day in Toronto; that was under discussion. I was then discussing another phase of the question entirely, particularly that the right hon. the Prime Minister had pledged himself publicly to submit the imperial conference resolutions for the approval of the house, and had afterwards refused to do so. He himself and the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Lapointe) had given interpretations which I did not think were clearly expressed in the resolutions, as I have stated. My own opinion with regard to those resolutions is expressed and their real implications are contained in addresses which I gave in December, 1926, and also in May, 1928, from which I read to this house, and I am quite prepared to submit what I said on all three occasions to the judgment of the right hon. gentleman and to the house.

I did not state that the right hon. gentleman had deceived the house. I said that his comments were due to a misapprehension on his part of the real tenor of those discussions. Certainly I adhere to everything I then said, so far as my memory is clear as to what I did say.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—and it is a question of facts now,—I have the right to say what the facts were.

My hon. friend said that I did not refer to the debates of 1927, but if he will look at Hansard of May 24, containing the remarks to which he took exception, he will see that it was exactly the debates of 1927 that I was referring to. I said:

Those who were in this parliament in 1927 will remember that my right hon. leader and I were strongly criticized, not perhaps by my right hon. friend—

Meaning the leader of the opposition.

—for I do not believe he took part in that debate; he was absent from the house—but by the then leader, the Hon. Mr. Guthrie, and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George.

And it was in that debate that my hon. friend uttered the words which I have just mentioned—"disruption and destruction." That had nothing to do with the fact that the report had not been submitted to parliament for approval. My hon. friend was emphatic; he has a good memory and must remember having used the words "silly," "foolish," "half-baked," and such. I learned some words during that debate.

Mr. CAHAN: I am grateful to the right hon. gentleman for referring to the debates,

[Mr. Cahan.]

and I commend those debates to hon. gentlemen sitting opposite as well as to those sitting on my side of the house. I think a reading of them will not bear out the interpretation which the right hon. gentleman, through a misapprehension, gave the other evening, or the misapprehension he has expressed to-day.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): All's well that ends well.

#### GRAIN HANDLING AT QUEBEC

RATES FOR HANDLING FROM LAKE VESSELS THROUGH ELEVATOR AND FREE STORAGE—QUESTION OF TABLING DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of the house the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens) asked a question having to do with the handling of grain at the government elevator at Quebec, and referred to the questions placed on the order paper by himself and the answers that had been furnished to those questions. Those questions were fully and accurately answered. The matter was again discussed on the estimates when the vote for the national harbours board was up, and I think a full explanation and a complete statement of the facts was given at that time.

The first question, and apparently the one that is disturbing my hon. friend, was this:

1. Has the Minister of Transport recently concluded a special agreement with the Louis Dreyfus and Company or any of its allied or subsidiary companies for the handling of grain through the government elevator at Quebec?

The answer to that is not only "no," as given, but I can go further and say that the government never at any time considered concluding a special agreement with Louis Dreyfus and Company.

The situation that did arise, as I explained on the estimates, was that at the opening or before the opening of navigation, the government discovered that a differential rate had been applied to Quebec as against Montreal by lake carriers. The reason Louis Dreyfus and Company came into the scene at all was that earlier in the season they had notified the harbours board that they intended to make considerable use of the Quebec elevator this year. In 1933 or 1934, I am not sure which, a similar situation arose, in that the lake carriers applied a higher rate from the head of the lakes to Quebec than from the head of the lakes to Montreal. At that time shipments involved Canadian grain, and the board intervened by ruling that the lake carriers must remove the discrimination between the two ports.