

the most careful and serious discussion and consideration of every well wisher of our country, and especially of every well wisher for the development of Canada as a whole. We all know and realize, and I am sure that those who listened attentively to the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) to-night, as he recited the views and ideas and reports of men of twenty and thirty years ago in respect to the feasibility of the Georgian Bay ship canal undertaking, felt that it was probably a good thing, in the interests of Canada, that this work had not been undertaken at an earlier date, for the simple reason that the conditions to-day are not the conditions that we had fifteen, twenty or thirty years ago. We are face to face to-day with a condition of brighter hopes, greater prospects, and bigger things; and therefore I say that the responsibility resting on any individual who has to make a recommendation to his colleagues and to this Parliament upon such a national undertaking as this, is very great. He must be careful that no mistakes are made in the building and development for the great future trade of our country.

We in Canada have already expended something like \$135,000,000 on the various canals which we have constructed; and, with no attempt on my part to reflect on the judgment or the good intentions of those who from time to time had responsibility for the expenditure of those sums of money that have gone into the opening up of the different canals of Canada, still I am sure every hon. gentleman in this House agrees with me that, in the light of the great development that has taken place, in the light of the great hope that we have for the future, the men of to-day would not undertake to spend money as it has been spent in the past in respect to the opening up of the canal systems of our Dominion. Not only has this sum of \$135,000,000 already been expended on the various canal systems, but we have, as has been well stated this afternoon by my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, a duty to perform to-day, so to improve and increase those expenditures, that they may meet the requirements of the growing conditions of our country. In order that we may realize how we have spent that sum of money on various canals, I shall cite a few of the larger ones with the amounts that have been expended on them: Beauharnois, \$3,000,000; Carillon and Grenville, \$5,700,000; Chambly, \$2,900,000; Cornwall, \$9,730,000; Jachine, \$18,000,000;

[Mr. Rogers.]

Rideau, \$7,000,000; Sault Ste. Marie, \$5,700,000; Soulanges, \$8,000,000; St. Lawrence, \$3,500,000; Trent canal, \$12,000,000; Welland, \$37,000,000; Wallaceburg, \$11,000,000.

These are the figures in round numbers that go to make up the \$135,000,000 to which I have referred. I am simply quoting these figures as I believe they will be of interest to the hon. members and to this country as showing just what amount of money Canada has already invested in her canal systems. In addition to this, we have here an estimate that is proposed as being necessary for the improvement of the St. Mary's river, a great work that is, to my mind, of pressing and absolute necessity. The engineers of my department estimate that to bring the St. Mary's river to a depth of 25 feet would mean an expenditure of something like \$15,000,000. Then to deepen the channel from lake Huron to lake Erie through lake St. Clair and the Detroit river to a depth of 25 feet would require a sum of about \$18,000,000.

The Welland canal, as you know, is being improved to a depth of 25 feet at an estimated cost of \$45,000,000. In addition to this, if the St. Lawrence route is improved from there to Montreal, it is estimated that it will cost something like \$150,000,000 more. As to these figures, we have on record a report of the Deep Waterways Commission of the United States who had their engineers go over this same territory in the year 1900. They then estimated that a channel to the depth of something like 30 feet would cost something like \$300,000,000, covering the territory from Sault Ste. Marie to Montreal. But in the year 1906 a board of the United States army engineers were commissioned to report upon the feasibility of changing the existing project of a 20-foot ship canal from lake Superior to lake Huron and from lake Huron to lake Erie then in progress, to a depth of from 22 to 25 feet, connecting those lakes. They reported as follows:

The board concurs with the district engineers and the divisional engineer in the opinion that the obtaining of either 22 or 25 feet navigation in the Great Lakes should be deferred until it is plainly shown that a safe and reliable 20-foot channel is not equal to the necessities of lake commerce.

That was the recommendation of the American engineers at that time. I think that I voice the sentiment of this Parliament, and I am sure I voice the sentiment of this country, when I say that a 20-foot channel is no longer sufficiently great for the trade of western Canada, to bring it, as it should be brought, to the national