

the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) commenting upon his speech and calling his attention to the fact that it was a necessary thing to do if what he (Mr. Scott) advocates is going to be put into execution.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think we all admit that, "if it is going to be put into execution." but that "if" is what we want to remove.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will help my friend to remove it.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister has not made much progress yet.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Scott in his letter to the leader of the Progressive party said:

There is storage on the Great Lakes and the prairies for about 200 million bushels; at our seaport, for less than 20 millions. Buffalo and New York have much larger export storage than we, and I am told Canadian money is being used to increase the storage at Buffalo; and United States millers have lately put up four mills at or near Buffalo to grind our wheat in transit, in bond, to be exported from New York in competition with the product of Canadian flour mills, which had gained precedence in the export markets.

It is for all these reasons that I recommended in my report (page 14) that the advice of the Quebec Board of Trade of 1913 and of the Senate in 1922 (see pages four and seven) should be followed, and that 10 million bushels storage should be put up at each of the ports of Quebec, Halifax and St. John (Montreal, Vancouver and Prince Rupert are being provided for) without further delay.

It would be useless to build elevator storage unless there are steamship docks adjacent for the vessels carrying the grain. Hence the necessity of the \$5,000,000 vote for the Quebec harbour which is under discussion. And the want is urgent. Every year that you put it off, the more strongly you direct the trade to continue in the existing channels to United States seaports.

Now, the strong argument, and my friend from Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) used it again to-night, is that the Quebec Harbour Commission has not paid its interest. True; and we explained the reason the other day. But why should we always be met with that contention: you are not paying your interest. How many ports have been built in this country which are paying interest? I admit the port of Montreal is paying now and the port of Vancouver is paying on advances which were made to it by the government during the period of construction. It is very easy to pay under such circumstances, but Vancouver is a big port which is developing and which will be one of the great ports of the world. What about Halifax? The country has spent over \$17,000,000 at Halifax. Is anybody asking for interest from the port of Halifax when a vote is being requested for any other public works or extensions there? No. At St. John we have spent \$18,967,000, or about \$20,000,000 in round figures. Is anybody asking that interest should be paid at St. John before anything further is done there?

Mr. SPENCER: Is interest not being paid at St. John?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No interest is being asked from St. John. The port was built by the government without any loan, any advances.

Mr. CALDWELL: St. John is not under a harbour commission—

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. CALDWELL: —and the government own the docks and the works they have constructed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but conditions are the same. We are not complaining that we are not getting revenue there on the money spent.

Mr. HOEY: Was the dry dock at St. John built by the Department of Public Works?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know.

An hon. MEMBER: There was a subsidy act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was a subsidy act. This does not include the dry dock. The dry dock was built by the Department of Public Works and it is not under a harbour commission at all.

Mr. COOTE: Has the minister comparative figures showing the traffic through the ports of Halifax, St. John and Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the figures at hand. If there is more traffic at St. John and Halifax, as I suppose my hon. friend wants to suggest—

Mr. COOTE: I have not the information. It would be interesting to have it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —there would be more reason why they should make some return to the government, instead of Quebec being asked to return every cent it has received. In Toronto we have paid \$9,964,057.13, or in round figures \$10,000,000, and the big city of Toronto has not been asked to pay anything to the government by way of interest or return on the investment that has been made there, if it can be dignified by the name of an investment. It is not fair to meet the request of Quebec for larger harbour facilities by the contention: You have not paid interest. It was impossible to pay interest under the circumstances; but the advances are made by way of a loan, and I have the same hope as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) that, if the port of Quebec is given