

sea-board, but that it will carry the grain from all parts of the United States north of Kansas city, because traffic will follow the line of least resistance. In quoting such eminent authorities I cannot omit to quote from Mr. Robert Reford, who has made a particular study of transportation, and who has said:

The rates will be cut down to one-third their present cost, every fraction of which should go into the pockets of the wheat producers of the Great West.

Let me add the Erie barge canal, in the state of New York, of which we have heard so much and which will not begin to be of equal utility with the Georgian Bay canal, will cost as much as will the Georgian Bay canal, while the canalizing of the Mississippi to a depth of 12 or 14 feet would cost much more. In an article in the 'Scottish American' it is pointed out that even admitting the great drawback that our rivers are not free from ice, it is not possible that the United States canals can at all compete with the Georgian Bay canal. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves what would be the great advantage of this Georgian Bay canal, the construction of which has been before the people for the last 50 years or more, and hence is not a new question. In 1895 our grain exports amounted to 17,185,582 bushels, valued at \$11,537,433, and in 1909 our grain export amounted to 70,526,894 bushels, valued at \$63,884,355. These figures show that our trade in grain is constantly increasing, and even with the advent of the National Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Northern it is obvious that our railway systems in Canada will not be able to carry the growing wheat yield from the fields of the Northwest. Not only that, but when the Georgian Bay canal is built a great deal of the grain which now finds its outlet by American ports will be diverted by the Canadian route to our ocean port at Montreal. Sir, I am not opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal or any other Canadian canal, but I do believe that the moment you deepen the Welland canal the Americans will immediately build a canal from Oswego to Syracuse so as to enable them to carry the western grain right through to their own ships in New York harbour. That is a natural consequence, whereas if you build the Georgian Bay canal the grain that is to-day going by New York, not all of it, but a great deal of the grain that is going via New York, will find its way directly down the Ottawa river.

At the risk of wearying the House, I shall give a few statistics. The total traffic through the several canals of this country for 1908 amounted to 17,502,820 tons. Compare that with the Suez canal. In 1908, 13,633,283 tons of freight passed through the Suez canal, 4,000,000 less than through

our canals, and yet the revenue of the Suez canal in 1908 was \$20,605,524.

In 1908, 776,374 tons of grain passed down the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. On the St. Lawrence canals 2,900,102 tons of freight all told were moved. Of this 867,637 tons were agricultural products, 826,177 tons merchandise, and 430,004 tons coal and 180,022 tons were forest products. If I were speaking for the Ottawa district, I would say that 204,490 tons of freight that passed down the Ottawa river canals were the produce of our own forests. On the Sault Ste. Marie canal the total movement of freight was 12,759,216 tons.

They built a Manchester ship canal in England and yet it is only 35½ miles long, but it cost \$73,172,000. The revenue is about \$300,000. The Englishman is a wise man in business and if he will expend \$72,000,000 in order to get a revenue of \$300,000, why would we not expend \$100,000,000 to get a revenue that may amount to any sum and certainly will be a very large revenue. The building of the Manchester ship canal meant a great deal for Manchester. During its construction 17,000 men and boys were daily engaged. Since its construction new ideas have been started at Manchester and along the banks; warehouses and mills previously empty are now occupied and over 10,000 new houses have been built for the working people of that city.

I know that a number of gentlemen wish to speak this evening upon this subject, they are waiting for an opportunity, in fact I believe they are simply bubbling over with enthusiasm for this canal, and it will be unfair on my part to detain the House at any greater length. I wish I had a thousand voices to go throughout this country from one end to the other and proclaim the great advantages which this canal will have for Canada. To my own good loyal friends of this country, to my military friends, to my naval friends, let me say, that Major-General Gascoyne, when giving evidence before the Senate of this country, said that the imperial authorities were most anxious for the construction of this canal because it would be a splendid route in the way of the defence of this country. Let me quote his words, which I have here in French:

From a military standpoint, I positively state that so far as strategy is concerned I look upon this scheme as a most desirable one.

Of course—and I must say so in order to make myself plain—it depends a good deal upon the depth of the water you intend to have in the canal.

Mr. Chairman.—The depth would be 14 feet.

Major General Gascoigne.—I was going to ask myself for a depth of 14 feet.

If you construct the canal of 14 feet deep, I can say that it would be of the greatest value to the country on a strategical point of view. I