

ing trade from the west to the east almost entirely in the hands of Canada, and thus build up our great ocean ports on which we have spent so many millions. It has also been repeatedly proven that this canal would reduce the cost of carrying grain 3 to 4 cents a bushel, which would mean millions to the farmers of our northwest. To every farmer shipping 3,000 bushels of grain, that would mean about \$100 per year, and in a great many cases, the difference of 3 or 4 cents per bushel is the actual difference between profit and loss. Coal from eastern Canada could be carried to Ontario at from 45 cents to 65 cents per ton less than it can be brought from Pennsylvania.

In addition to this, the consumer would save the duty of fifty-three cents per ton. This is not a small item by any means. For, as pointed out by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) our coal importation for Ontario alone amounts to 8,500,000 tons, and there were carried to the port of Port Arthur alone, 1,500,000 tons for use on the various railways. There are large tracts of timber along or near the route of the Georgian Bay canal, which, at present are almost entirely worthless, or are being destroyed by fire or otherwise. This applies to hundreds and probably thousands of millions of feet of hardwood, and thousands of cords of pulpwood and ties. The increase in the value of this timber to Canada would of itself almost justify the building of the canal. Then, we have the matter of the power available and which would be made valuable by the construction of the canal. This is by far the greatest question connected with the opening of this route. This power is estimated at 1,000,000 horse-power, to be developed at an average cost of \$50 per horse-power, or, in other words, about \$2 per horse-power per year. A great deal of this power will not be required for many years, and I have no doubt, knowing as I do many of the situations, that a number of these powers could be developed for about half this estimated cost. The advantage of developing this power can hardly be over-estimated. Canada should be, and with this power developed would be, in a position to control almost entirely the paper and furniture trade of the world, for we should have the supply of raw material and the power at the same point, and we should have reduced cost for the transportation of the finished article. As an example, we have the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis whose prosperity is entirely owing to the fact that they have cheap power at their door.

We find then, that all reports on this canal have been favourable; that almost all parts of Canada would be directly benefited; that the cost of transportation would be reduced from the west and the use of

Mr. ARTHURS.

Canadian coal made possible in Ontario; that timber would be made valuable which is now almost worthless; that power would be developed to afford opportunities for Canadian factories. Any one of these would justify as a business proposition the building of this canal.

The question of building this canal should not be made a party question, and it is a matter of regret that in the past both parties have used it to a certain extent at election times. But I believe that the people interested are united in declaring that the canal should be built at once; they are tired of having canals on paper, and surveys of canals, and they believe that at present the proper course is to build without delay a canal that will float a ship.

However, the question at the present time is whether or not it is advisable to spend the money necessary for so great a work. In this connection, I would call the attention of the House for a moment to a few remarks made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) on the debate on the Budget. On January 18, as reported at page 2151 of 'Hansard', the hon. gentleman used these words:

I hold that more can be done to benefit the agriculturist of Canada by reducing to him the cost of getting his goods in the market than by a reduction of the tariff. A reduction in the tariff is all right so far as you can go, but the farmer is vastly more interested in the wise expenditure of all the money that comes into the public treasury, contributed by all classes as well as by himself, in bettering the facilities for transport and cheapening its cost. If by improving our transportation facilities we can reduce by two or three cents a bushel the cost of landing produce in the consuming market, fancy what a benefit that is to the producer in the west, not only on one year's crop but on the crop of every succeeding year. Take, for example, the \$3,360,000, contributed to the treasury by all the people of Canada, which this government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build 330 miles of a railway from Lethbridge to Nelson.

Then at page 2152:

By that means, we obtained a reduction which we could not have got otherwise. Among other reductions in freight rates, was a reduction of three cents per 100 pounds on all grain coming out of that country. What did that amount to? Figure it out, and you will find that the farmers, within four years, got back the whole of the \$3,300,000, and they are reaping a proportionate and like benefit until this day and will be for all time to come.

And again, at page 2153:

What does that mean to the people in the Northwest? While I do not undervalue their request for a lower tariff, what is that in comparison with the benefit they can derive from the wise expenditure of money out of the public treasury to which all the people in the country contribute? It means millions.