

we make the river and St. Lawrence Canals navigation available there will still always be transshipment from lake to river vessels. Therefore the Welland Canal should be deepened as speedily as possible so as to allow the largest vessels to pass down to where river navigation begins. Transshipment will almost always be the rule at that point because it will pay best to transship. A small tug can take through the river part of the route to Montreal the cargoes of two large propellers put into barges. For the propellers with their powerful engines to be put to do the river work would be a use less waste of power; putting a man to do a boys work. Some years ago when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Public Works Department he very wisely took steps that the two entrances to the canal should be at once constructed for a depth of 14 feet. Increasing the depth throughout now between the two end, or "water," locks is rather a question of raising the banks than lowering the bottom of the canal. While the enlargement of the Welland Canal was being debated at that time I was absent from Canada, residing in the United States, but taking the interest I have never ceased to take in our canal navigation I addressed a letter on the subject to the Hon. Mr. Kirkpatrick, the present Speaker, and from that letter he read a portion which I find reported as follows in the *Hansard* of that year:

"The Welland Canal never can perform its proper functions so long as larger vessels can put in at Buffalo than can come down to Kingston, and it seems really too bad, with our long canal experience in Canada, the improvements now entered upon should be deliberately planned on an imperfect and insufficient model. I have always contended that until the foot of Lake Ontario be made for Montreal what the foot of Lake Erie is to New York—the great transshipping point from lake to lake (and river) craft—we never will be in a position to compete on equal terms—where we should be able to do so on much better terms—with Buffalo."

I also find, looking over some documents relating to the same subject, that about 1873, I think it was, a large number of vessel-owners submitted a memorandum to the then Minister of Public Works, in which they said:

"We are fully certain that the tolls on the tonnage of vessels and their cargoes, that will pass the Welland Canal on a draught of 14 feet of water, over and above what will pass if the draught is restricted to 12 feet only, will more than meet the interest at 5 per cent., and a sinking fund of 1 per cent. on the amount necessary, say \$1,000,000 or more, required to deepen the canal and harbors at the extremities to the desired depth."

The same memorandum states that the forwarders and owners of vessels would be willing to pay twice as much per ton for canal tolls in a vessel drawing 14 feet of water as they would be willing to pay where vessels were restricted to 12 feet draft.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is precisely with that object that the late Government did take steps to make the Welland Canal 14 feet. I know it was my hon. friend's intention at the earliest possible moment to give 14 feet depth to the Welland Canal. That bears very forcibly, however, on the whole question as to the wisdom of some of these expenditures immediately after discussion.

Mr. SHANLY. Expenditures at other points?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend's contention is right, and speaking personally I have always thought that there was an immense deal in it—not merely for the reasons my hon. friend has stated, but because it is constantly known to the trade that barges are used as floating warehouses which these large vessels cannot be, except at great expense, when they come down from Montreal. We ought to be careful about undertaking the expenditure of large sums of money for the deepening of the water way between Kingston and Montreal, and it is in that direction that I was enquiring from the Acting Minister of Railways as to the estimated cost, and what general determination the Government had come to, because, although there was good reason, I suppose, to finish the Cornwall and Lachine

Mr. SHANLY.

Canals, there can be no good reason for constructing locks at 14 feet at points like Williamsburgh.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The deepening of the Lachine Canal was practically to extend the harbor of Montreal.

Mr. SHANLY. Quite true, and very properly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was no difficulty at all about the necessity of having 14 feet depth of water. I am exceedingly pleased that my hon. friend from Grenville has expressed himself as he has about the inutility of enlarging the other canals at the present moment. The existing locks are quite large enough for barges. If we have to depend upon them, as I think we must, in the transmission of grain to a large extent, enlarging these locks to the size of the Welland, seems to me at present out of place. I am sorry I am not able to express myself more fully.

Mr. VAIL. I observed the other day a statement that the Government have lowered the canal tolls, which, if true, is a matter of considerable importance when large appropriations are being made for the improvement of the canal system. Now, if we are going on expending money from year to year on these canals, and if we are going to give up the tolls on them, I should like to know where we are going to get a return for the money expended. I have no doubt that the improvement of the canals will increase the trade to a certain extent, but at the same time we ought to consider that promises were made when this money was voted, that a fair return should be made to the country for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to understand from the Minister whether it is already determined upon to commence the work.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Digby. If the Government think proper to lower the tolls in order to benefit the trade of the country and get the trade of the North-West to come by the St. Lawrence, I am sure the country at large will be benefited in other ways. I am an old man, but I hope to live to see the day when the canals of this country will do a much larger business than they are doing now. Then we must also consider the question of the elevation of grain at Kingston, the cost of which would have to be added to the expense of taking grain from that port to Montreal. I believe that the deepening of the St. Lawrence will cost an immense amount of money, and we should pause before we undertake it. But I am sure that the Welland Canal ought to be deepened to 14 feet, and then we should raise the locks from Thorold to Lake Ontario, which, I believe, can be done with \$1,000,000, and could be completed by the opening of the navigation in 1887. I am satisfied that if the Welland canal is improved, it will pay, whether the Government refuses to give the people a free toll or not.

Mr. VAIL. We were told in this House over and over again when these appropriations were asked for, and when we were asking for small sums for the Maritime Provinces, that this canal expenditure would be returned to us. But we have had no return, and now it is proposed to increase the expenditure.

Mr. SHANLY. This question of canal tolls will be more keenly agitated from year to year. It is impossible to look at the canal returns without confessing, however humiliating it may be, that after the large expenditures we have made, at this moment our canal system stands a failure. The hon. member for Digby asks how are we going to get a return for our large outlay without charging tolls. I say that if we were doing the largest trade that could possibly be done through the canals, the tolls collected would still be the smallest part of the benefit the country would derive from the canals. Therefore, I say, that in the present state of the canal trade—and it cannot well be worse—if we can increase our trade by throwing off the tolls altogether, I, for