

International Joint Commission to investigate this whole question. The commission had hearings all over the United States in cities where it was necessary, and in Canada, from Montreal in the east to Calgary in the west, until December 19, 1921, two years less one month, when they put in their report. So they had nearly two years to consider this question. They listened to all sides of it. They heard the engineers and had their reports. They heard the question debated pro and con, and their report in brief is as follows. Despite what my hon. friend from St. James read from the report, this is its substance in a very few words.

First, they think the canal is advisable from shipping, economic, and transportation standpoints.

Second, the cost will be \$252,000,000 plus the cost of the Welland canal. Canada has built the Welland canal, but the commission propose that the Welland canal cost be included, and I believe it should be, although this canal is entirely within Canadian borders. The commission recommend that the cost of the Welland canal should be put in and ultimately divided between the two countries. The United States would pay a larger proportion than Canada because it is more populous, has a much richer population, and will make more use of the canal, as the commission recommend that the cost of the St. Lawrence canal and Welland canal should be divided between the two countries in proportion to the benefits received. In other words, the commission propose that the cost should be paid to a much greater extent by the United States than by Canada. For instance, if the total cost was \$252,000,000, the United States would pay more than half of it, perhaps \$152,000,000, although the commission do not go into that, but the United States, being a much larger country and having much heavier shipping, would naturally pay more than we would.

In closing, there is one sentimental reason which I have not yet touched upon. I do not believe it is a good thing to mix sentiment or patriotism with business, but at the same time it is worth remembering that this country and the United States have lived side by side for over a hundred years without having had any serious differences. We have a border of three thousand miles, with not a gun or a fort on either side. There has been no war between these two countries since 1812. That seems to me a very fine example, to the European world particularly, of what two

countries with friendly feelings and decent common sense can do if they wish, settling their differences, not by fighting each other, but by arbitration. I should like to point out, although there is nothing original in this, as it has been said before, that the building of this canal might well be a magnificent monument to the international amity and good understanding between the United States and Canada.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I cannot very well refuse to take up the challenge that has been made to the Progressives by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). He seems to have taken it for granted, either that we are entirely ignorant of the subject, or not interested in it at all. I am glad that the hon. member has made his confession that he, as well as perhaps others in other parts of this House, is sometimes dominated by sectional interests. It would, perhaps, be in order for some of his colleagues to express the same interest in their own moral welfare as they have already done in the moral welfare of the Progressives lest we be unduly carried away by that demon of selfishness.

Like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Manion), I have a great vision in regard to these Great Lakes. I have sufficient faith in the wisdom of Providence to believe they were put there for a great purpose, and that some time these lakes will be serving to a much greater extent than they are to-day the purpose for which they have been located in the heart of this continent. It is, of course, a question whether these lakes are being used to the fullest possible extent to-day. The statement is made in some quarters that this is the case. On this point I do not presume to pronounce an opinion, but I do know that the statement is made that we can better afford to pay the cost of the elevating charges that are rendered necessary under the present system, besides paying many other expenses, than we could afford to build this canal under present conditions. Whether that is so or not, I do not know. That the project is a great possibility from an engineering standpoint, I do not suppose any person will deny. That it can be made a commercial success is, of course, a question that can well be taken into consideration.

I think it is unfortunate that some of the objections that have been made to this great project have borne too clearly the evidence of sectional interest. It is un-