Mr. SIFTON: Our company prepared a very elaborate survey, detailed plans, and such like, previous to 1907. Mr. Wisner came over and conducted the investigation. The government said, in effect, "We have no independent means of making this investigation; we only have the ex-parte system of the statement of the Canal Company, as to this whole mass of survey; we will appoint our Commission to check those surveys and resurvey it for ourselves, and give us an independent report," so they took our surveys and everything which we proposed, and they took them as part of what they were investigating, and used them throughout the investigation by the government. They adopted a very substantial proportion of the plans and suggestions contained in our original survey, so that this government survey is really a survey of plans, and an investigation which has been checked twice, once by us, and rechecked and certified by the government, independently.

Mr. HANSON: Is that the Ellis Commission?

Mr. SIFTON: No, I am referring to the Public Works of Canada Report of the Georgian Bay Ship Canal of 1908—in five volumes.

Mr. MILLAR: Returning again to the grain rate question, Mr. Sifton, I would like to ask if the figures you gave—if those who presented those figures have taken fully into consideration the enormous handicap this route would be under in the carrying of freight having only a 24-foot depth, as against a 30-foot depth in the St. Lawrence. I have seen somewhere that a large boat, well loaded down, would require, I think, 80 tons to sink it another inch; that means 960 tons a foot. It seemed so enormous that I almost hesitate to give those figures, yet I am convinced that my memory is serving me right. Now, a 24-foot waterway would be at a very great disadvantage against a 30-foot waterway, and as you know, the tendency always is to have larger boats, rather than smaller.

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: The Joint Board of the St. Lawrence waterway has recommended a 25-foot waterway for the St. Lawrence.

Mr. MILLAR: On the Georgian Bay Canal?

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: No, the International waterway on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. MILLAR: Then there will only be the handicap of one foot.

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: If you are comparing these two, yes.

Mr. SIFTON: Our English shareholders—or some of them—are very closely affiliated with some of the largest shipping companies in the world, located in the city of London. I am not an expert shipping man myself, but I have heard them go into that question many times, and heard their views about it, and the view of the English shipping experts in regard to that is this, that up to about 10,000 tons there is a definite saving; as the unit gets larger the unit cost is decreased. Possibly of late years it has gone to something above 10,000 tons, but when you get substantially above 10,000 tons, far from a saving it means a loss, because the larger ships cost more in proportion to operate. That is certainly true when you get above 15,000 tons. You can find in the statistics of ships under construction now, as shown in Lloyd's Register, that by far the greater proportion are ships of 10,000 tons and under.

Mr. MILLAR: But 24 feet would be a disadvantage as against 25 or 26 feet?

Mr. SIFTON: No, I don't think so. If they will take the economic units, there is no disadvantage.

Mr. MILLAR: You do not contend that a 24-foot channel would take the larger ships carrying grain on the lakes?

Mr. SIFTON: It would take a 10,000 ton ship as it stands now. Let us take a 10,000 ton unit—I do not know the exact basis of the existing large unit— but a