

enjoy the benefit and the satisfaction of the education you have received, and become useful and helpful to yourself and to others." Whether my remarks had any effect, I do not know, but at least he desisted from his extremist activities.

In discussing cultural matters I may be getting on dangerous ground. But I have known men who, though they could not write their names, were perfect gentlemen, and I have met other men with university degrees who were boors of the worst kind. I recall especially a man who for many years was a foreman in lumber camps, and although he had little formal education he impressed me with his ability to get along with others and do a good job. As honourable senators know, not everybody can handle crews up to 150 men. He spent the greater part of his time in the bush, and the entire drive each spring was supervised by him. When he retired, in his late seventies, he came to Blaine Lake. As he was watching me drive one team of horses and lead another, he asked if I needed a man. I said I did, and I hired him. He was a perfect gentleman, he was intelligent, and he could talk well. He told me interesting stories about cruising for timber. He had done a great deal of it in different limits for the Edwards Lumber Company, and, strange though it may seem, he could compete with men who were university graduates in this type of work and beat them hands down. Though he had clerks in his camps, he had estimated so many million feet of lumber at one time and another, and had the whole picture so firmly in his mind, that estimating timber was second nature to him.

At this point may I put myself right in one respect? I recently received quite a sarcastic letter from a resident in the riding of the honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid). It was based on a press report that I had opposed assistance for the carriage of feed grain from the Prairies. If I gave that impression, it was not my intention. I do not and did not oppose a reduction of freight rates on grain from the Prairies. The writer suggested that I know very little about British Columbia. It may astonish him, but I know quite a lot about that province. In my travels through Vancouver Island and the mainland of British Columbia I found a few farmers who sell grain, and they expressed opposition to cheap freight rates cutting into the price of their products. Incidentally, a lot of good grain is grown in Creston, B.C., which has an elevator or two, and oats are produced on the higher ranges of the Cariboo country. I am all in favour of these farmers getting the best rate possible.

I am opposed to the Government's method of contributing \$50 million to university education. If the Government is anxious to help out our young people let it reduce the income tax on our young married people with small incomes, and for goodness sake let these people invest their own money rather than invest it for them. There is really no limit to what the Government will spend—\$10 million here and \$100 million there—but it keeps putting its hands into the Canadian taxpayers' pockets until they haven't a dollar left to invest in their own natural resources. That is my chief complaint.

I venture to say that the St. Lawrence seaway is going to cost about \$300 million more than originally estimated. Now they are talking about what tolls will be charged on the seaway, and in this connection I would like to read an extract from the *Toronto Telegram* of Wednesday, December 5, 1956. It is datelined Washington, and reads:

The tricky question of what tolls will be charged on the St. Lawrence seaway is coming up for discussion on Thursday at a meeting in New York of the Canadian and American seaway authorities. Working out a solution will take time and patience. In principle it is simple: tolls should be high enough to ensure amortization of the seaway costs chargeable to navigation and low enough to attract enough shipping to provide low competitive freight rates for the inland market.

But what might have been a fairly simple exercise has been complicated by the American decision to make the seaway a subsidized route for American flag vessels trading with northern and western Europe.

This body blow to free enterprise and international competition was public recognition of the thesis that the American merchant marine has been clamped to the treasury for so long that it could not survive in competitive conditions. This year's budget will subsidize the industry to the tune of \$100,000,000.

The formula authorizing federal subsidies is the declaration that a shipping route is "essential to the trade and economy of the nation". This was promulgated for the Great Lakes-northern and western Europe route last February 7.

It means that every trip made by an American freighter into the Great Lakes will be subsidized up to \$750 a day. This is in addition to an original building grant of about 40 per cent of construction costs, and a 50 per cent cargo preference.

The American subsidized fleet consists of 306 vessels, none of which was built for Great Lakes conditions. In fact no American ocean-going lines at present operate on the Great Lakes. The Maritime Administration subsidy is therefore an attempt to bite into a field which since World War II had been cultivated by specialized vessels of German and Norwegian registry, plus a substantial number flying the flags of Sweden and The Netherlands.

This state-subsidized grab sorts strangely with the professions of devotion to free enterprise which the United States makes for itself and recommends to others. The Maritime Administration's subsidies are, in fact, one of the most unpopular of all American protective measures, and evoke a continuous volume of criticism from all shipowning countries.

It contrasts markedly with Canadian policy, which has refused to discriminate against foreign