

I am not in any way opposing the deepening of the Welland canal, but I say it appears from this recommendation that the commission preferred, as an immediate solution of the difficulty, the carrying of grain from the great lakes, not to Kingston or 180 miles from Montreal, but clean down to the head of navigation, and that by a canal projected down the St. Lawrence reaching as far as the maritime provinces which, although remote from the canal itself, would derive immense benefit from the carriage of their coal and other goods through the water-way, from the maritime provinces, without transhipment, clean beyond Duluth to the end of the great lakes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood my hon. friend to say that the government had not carried out one single suggestion made by this transportation commission. Let me ask him whether he would suggest that there has been the slightest delay in carrying forward and completing the survey for the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. MONK. I did not say that the government had not carried out a single suggestion, but I said an important suggestion, and I gave as a first instance the question of free ports. I singled out that one because it must be perfectly evident to every hon. member that until that suggestion is carried out, we stand in a position of absolute inferiority to the United States. Take only the great lakes ports, Superior and Duluth, and see how these are equipped. Their equipment is something marvellous; people come from the old world to see it. Compare these American ports with ours. In ours there is by comparison practically no equipment. That suggestion, therefore, of the commission has not been carried out to any extent by this government. In Montreal we have an admirable commission which deserves better encouragement. It has, by borrowing money on its own credit, carried out very important improvements, but the work is by no means finished. Any one who takes the trouble to read the splendid report of the chairman of that commission, Major Stephens, made after his return from Europe, must come to the conclusion that we shall have to spend at least \$80,000,000 if we want to place Montreal on a footing at all equal to that of the great ports of Europe which he visited, the least important of which had expended on it at least \$30,000,000. If we want to put Montreal on the same footing as Boston and New York and other American ports, and European ports as well, we must be prepared to spend \$100,000,000.

There were suggestions less important carried out, because the shipping interests stood behind them and insisted on their being carried out. Take the St. Lawrence ship channel, the better lighting of the route between Montreal and Quebec, that

Mr. MONK.

has been attended to, although I am informed that a number of the lighthouses put up between those two ports have already tumbled into the water, as most government works do. But there has been an attempt in that direction, and probably also on the great lakes, because the shipping interests were there and insisted on this report being carried out which the government wanted to pigeon-hole. But these are minor points. What have they done in respect of the more important matters? Have they enlarged the Welland canal? Have they made a single start towards constructing the Georgian Bay canal? My hon. friend will say that surveys have been made. This matter has been brought up every year for the last fifteen years, and I have every year heard from the ministers the same generalities and the same replies. True, partial surveys were made before. But this last report is an admirable one. It was finished some time ago and distributed. Has the government shown any haste to make known its policy? We know that statements are made in the United States that if we should build this Georgian Bay canal, it will take the whole trade of the west, both American and Canadian, and our people are beginning to clamour for it. But when the government is urged to build it, they reply, as the right hon. the Prime Minister did a short while ago in an interview: We will attend to this work as soon as we have the money. But nothing is done. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) insisted, and insisted very properly, a moment ago, that work should be done on a section of that canal. Why, we have lost about \$10,000,000 from the fact that we did not begin that section 10 years ago. And we are losing every year about thirty per cent on the cost of that section—about \$10,000,000—by that increase in value. If the government had constructed the French river end a few years ago at an estimated cost of \$5,000,000, we should now have the advantage of the development and increase of population which have been spoken of in this debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which section?

Mr. MONK. The French river section.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About \$13,000,000.

Mr. MONK. I understood that it was much less. But what about the section in the vicinity of Montreal, which should have been begun ten years ago and on which, had it been finished, there would have been an immense saving in the cost of labour as well as the saving of the frightful increase every day in the cost of expropriation?

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), but perhaps he will allow me to ask him