

only one-third of it, yet pulled it down and built one nine times bigger? Would his wife and children not be entitled to go to a court and ask to have him declared insane? Well, that is the kind of thing both our parties have been doing when in power.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Will the honourable gentleman allow me to ask him a question? How much would the Welland Canal have carried if instead of being fourteen feet deep it had been completely obsolete with a depth of, say, eight, nine or ten feet? Would it have had any traffic at all?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: I am very glad my honourable friend has brought that up. The Germans are great engineers, and if you go to Germany you will find that their big canals are about five or six feet deep, with locks a thousand feet long, and on their barges of shallow draft they manage to carry a large tonnage. I would refer my honourable friend to the speech I made on this very subject in the Senate in 1919. Starting during the War, in the year 1917, the German people decided to improve their country by building a number of canals, and they began twenty-nine of them that criss-crossed the country. There are four big rivers there, the Rhine, the Weser, the Oder and the Elbe. There are mountains intervening, but the German engineers built their canals up there, and they constructed large reservoirs for filling the locks. At the same time they are using every drop of water for electrical development purposes. My honourable friend would be well posted if he read that speech of mine.

The first estimate of the cost of the Welland Canal was placed at \$30,000,000; the second one was \$50,000,000; and the actual cost was \$175,000,000. That gives some idea of how costs exceed estimates. It is often said that the farmers would save from three to four cents—some people say even as much as twelve cents—a bushel on the shipment of their grain via the new seaway. Well, the Canada Steamships Lines, of which I am the oldest director, carried grain through last summer for less than three cents, and we had to take 1.4 cent off that for elevator transfer. So honourable members can see what was left for the ships. If this wonderful seaway is going to do business at all it will take every ton of freight from the railways. The people of Canada, through the Canadian National, own sixty per cent of the railway mileage in the country; so by building the seaway we should be abolishing the revenue of our own railways. Do honourable members think that would be a wise thing to do?

In conclusion, I may say quite definitely that hitherto I have always been opposed to this international waterway, but now I must confess I am somewhat in a quandary. After reading the almost incredible terms of the treaty, I asked myself whether I should be justified in continuing my opposition to it, seeing that under this treaty Uncle Sam actually obligates himself to the spending of hundreds of millions of his good dollars on works in Canadian territory, in which solely Canadian labour and materials are to be employed. When the United States spent money on the construction of the Panama Canal they took good care to acquire ownership of the whole territory in which those works were to be carried on. There is not a word in this treaty about acquiring any of Canada's territory. There may be a good reason for that. Uncle Sam may have figured out that Canada would be reluctant to enter into this bargain if cession of territory were a condition. Does he now nurse the idea that if he carries out American works here with his own money, the protection of those works may later entitle him to some kind of jurisdiction about which nothing need for the moment be said? I do not know what the explanation is, but I say frankly that I cannot understand why Uncle Sam is so ready to shovel dollars by the hundreds of millions into Canada, as is now proposed, if he is not planning to hold possession, in some way, of the works those dollars will represent. It is all very puzzling, and it brings to my mind the old saw, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." I fear the Greeks when they come bearing gifts.

We hear about Canada's prosperity. Well, let us look back a bit, over the last fifty years. The Liberals were in power twenty-five years and the Conservatives for an equal period. During the Liberal regime there was great prosperity, with tax reduction and financial surpluses, but when the Conservatives were in power there were depressions and everything seemed to go wrong.

In 1888, forty-six years ago, I was making the cadastral surveys in the county of Compton, in the townships of Compton, Clifton and Whitton. These townships are each ten by ten miles, or one hundred square miles; so the three of them covered a territory of some three hundred square miles. That was ten years after the introduction of the National Policy, but the farms were deserted and the people were fleeing from the country. I witnessed the conditions with my own eyes. Our cadastral plans had to be accompanied by a book of reference, and in this book we were required to give the names of the owners of properties. Well, I would go to a farm