

St. Lawrence Waterway

Government to say whether or not the power shall be exported or whether or not the falls shall be developed.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend has just said that there is no market for the power to be developed in Canada, so that if any power of value is developed, it would be for export purposes.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend should not put words in my mouth. I did not say there was no market; I said there was not a market for the 3,000,000 horse-power which would be Canada's share of the development. There is some market in Canada for it, and I have no doubt that by the development of some of this horse-power, hives of industry would be established along the St. Lawrence, and part of the cost of the development could thereby be met. But the question which my hon. friend brings up is a matter for the future. It would have to be decided by the Government whether the export of this power should be permitted.

The development of electric power would reduce the use of coal on the railways; certainly the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National lines between Toronto and Montreal would be operated entirely by the power developed from the St. Lawrence Canal system.

Now, anybody who wishes to get the arguments on this question from the Canadian standpoint can get them by referring to the Congressional Record of April 18th last. Senator Calder, representing New York state, opposed the building of these canals, mainly upon the ground that they would be of more benefit to Canada than they would be to the United States. I wish to quote just a few short passages from a very lengthy speech which he made. He said:

From the wheat growers' standpoint, therefore, the St. Lawrence waterway must be judged upon the basis of its effect upon a bushel of wheat laid down in Liverpool.

Then he quotes Mr. Craig, of Duluth:

Then, says Mr. Craig: The Canadian Northwest can double its acreage, multiply it fourfold, eightfold even, before its land is utilized to its last acre.

Then the Senator continues:

That is the vision—a Canadian acreage multiplied eightfold—with which Craig would comfort the American wheat grower.

Further down he says:

With these figures that I have submitted to you in mind it is very easy indeed to understand why our Canadian brethren should be willing, even anxious, for us to construct a

[Mr. Manion.]

highway to the sea that will bring Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta a few days nearer to Liverpool. And it is easy to understand why Great Britain, the master wheat merchant of the world, should look with favour upon any plan we undertake that will make the resources of her own rich provinces in any way more accessible to her.

And further on:

There are other reasons why Canada should be interested in the canal. She is a growing country. Her own commerce is increasing by leaps and bounds. She is particularly concerned with the fuel problem, being, as her editors and statesmen are accustomed to remark, now dependent upon the United States for coal. The Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association makes out a very convincing case—for Canada. It says:

During 1919 Canada imported 13,000,000 tons of bituminous coal from the United States at a cost of \$130,000,000.

In Alberta and in the Maritime provinces—

This, perhaps, will answer to a certain extent the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Vien).

—Canada has a plentiful supply of bituminous coal, but the high rail freight rates prevent its distribution.

Open the St. Lawrence locks to large freighters and Canadian bituminous coal will supply the Canadian market.

Then he gives very excellent reasons why the canal should be constructed by Canada. I will give two more short quotations:

By this showing, Canada's interest in the proposed waterway outruns that of Uncle Sam's by the ratio of 3 to 1. Then, too, Canada looks to the canal to save it five cents a bushel on its wheat. It is seeking an outlet for its millions upon millions of undeveloped land.

Finally he says:

I cite these facts for the purpose of calling your attention not only to Canada's interest in the proposed waterway but to its preponderance of interest. Its wheat farmers have a greater stake in the proposed canal than our own.

To anybody interested in this question that is a very interesting speech. There was a reply by Senator Townsend, who favoured the canal in an impromptu speech. He was not prepared because he did not know the matter was coming up, but both speeches are very informative on this question.

Somebody, I think it was my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret), spoke as if this matter was being decided on a theoretical or idealistic basis, without an investigation. We are not speaking on this question without an investigation. As a matter of fact, on January 21, 1920, the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States united in instructing the