

before you could complete it you would have congestion in the canals, and the present system would not be able to cope with the traffic that should offer.

Then, in answer to the question, "And we shall lose traffic?" Colonel Dubuc said:

Either it will be diverted to American ports, or else it may find its way down to the lower end of Lake Ontario and then move by rail to Montreal at whatever extra cost this may be. It may equally be diverted by rail to Pacific ports or by boat to Georgian Bay ports and rail to the seaboard, or by the new Hudson Bay route now under construction to Fort Churchill.

There is other evidence of the same kind.

Q. You have to have more canals to keep on with anything like that increase in business?

Col. Dubuc: Exactly. You would later have to rebuild your whole system.

Then, later, I find the following:

Q. The cost of the deep waterway has to be increased by the cost of these necessary improvements?

Col. Dubuc: If you want to have your canal system able to handle the traffic which is liable to present itself in the next ensuing years.

Q. Your present capacity would be quite exhausted by—what did they tell us?—I think 1934?

Col. Dubuc: The traffic will depend on many things.

I hope the traffic will not be absolutely congested by 1934 and that we shall still be carrying on in a fairly satisfactory way, as we have done in the past. But my point is that the possible exhaustion of our facilities for transport is one of the things that should determine us to weigh fully the advantages of a still greater development for carrying the trade of Canada so that the business and the wealth and the reputation of Canada may go on increasing.

One frequently hears the statement that the building of the St. Lawrence Waterway to enable ocean vessels to reach the lakes is going to hurt the port of Montreal. I have looked over the history of a considerable number of the ports of the world and I have not been able to find a single instance in which a port with an established business has not almost immediately experienced a great increase in traffic when it has been bold in increasing its facilities. I have made some notes to which it will not take me long to refer.

For example, up to the year 1863 Antwerp was under the disadvantage of having to pay toll on the Scheldt to Holland. In that year, when Antwerp was opened to the business of the outer world by the purchase of the Dutch right to levy toll, its business amounted to half a million tons. In 1913 it had increased to

fourteen million tons. Then came the unhappy interruption of the War. Step by step port facilities were increased, but the increase has been justified, and in 1926 the business of Antwerp amounted to twenty-two million tons. Antwerp has now started to carry out one of the largest schemes of port development that have ever been undertaken, namely, to provide dockage facilities of no less than 1,300 acres. Liverpool and similar ports have something like 300 or 400 acres.

We know something about Liverpool and Manchester. With respect to traffic going by an already established port, the situation of Liverpool is the nearest parallel I know to that of Montreal. Manchester, as you know, is the centre of the most thickly populated industrial area in the world. In the early eighties it was in a grievous state. In 1881 there were eighteen thousand empty houses in Manchester, trade was leaving it and mills were moving to Liverpool, Glasgow, and other places where cotton and other commodities moving inward or outward would not have to be towed such a great distance. A Manchester man of no great importance at this time, a Mr. Adamson, thought the situation intolerable. He got some people to join with him, and together they developed the idea of the Manchester Ship Canal. It took them three years to get their Bill passed by Parliament. Liverpool objected, and the railways objected, but finally the Bill was passed in 1885. The working people of Manchester were heart and soul behind the project, and one history of the development tells us that of the first £100,000 raised to carry on the work £60,000 were in subscriptions of £10 each. The work was begun in 1887, and the canal was opened in 1894. During the first year the canal carried 900,000 tons and earned £97,000. The first dividend was paid in 1915. In 1927 six million tons entered the port of Manchester, and the port authorities earned £1,567,000. One would have thought that such a volume of business going direct to Manchester would have injured Liverpool, but the railways lowered their rates and the port of Liverpool continued to grow and to increase its facilities. One of the ironies of fate is that Liverpool is the chief market of the world for cotton, the great standby of Manchester. I am sure that what Liverpool or any other place has done Montreal can do, and will do if occasion arises.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Michener, the debate was adjourned.