

but I doubt that we should see the cash for the carrying out of the project. But if that were the case, do you think we would want in Canada, particularly through the old province of Quebec, a navigation canal or a deepening of the St. Lawrence that was paid for altogether by another country and must be controlled by them to a large extent when they had put the money into it? Why, that would be worse than anything suggested for an international arrangement. If this St. Lawrence deepening is to proceed Canada will want her fair share of power and of benefit in navigation and independently will pay her share of the cost, and we need not consider the proposal on any other ground.

There are two sides to the St. Lawrence development. One particular school talks navigation, but means power, and the great agitation for it, I think, is from those who look for the development of power. There is a school in favour of this great project that sees a vision of the Great Lake ports becoming ocean ports. I think that is possible, but this is the view to which I desire to draw attention, and which, if my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) will allow me, I would impress upon the Government. Notwithstanding any criticism, do not rush too rapidly at this thing. It means more than any of us realize. It may not come in my time, but it will come. But let us know on what grounds it is to be done, and where we shall be at when it is done. Above all, do not allow any people to get any of our rights by paying a little of their money.

Now, this is what I would suggest to the Government. The National Advisory Board was appointed for a purpose. The United States Government appointed a board of the same kind, with Mr. Hoover at its head; but—I say it with all respect—Mr. Hoover's Committee made a report before it had the report of the joint engineers in its entirety. There were two engineering boards, one for the United States and one for Canada, but these met together and formed a joint board of investigation. The respective National Advisory Boards, on the two sides of the line, were absolutely different, and they never met together. The distinct purpose of one was to ascertain and advise the United States Government whether or not it would be in the interest of that country to have the work done. The other Advisory Board was to meet independently and advise the Canadian Government whether it would be in the interest of Canada. Now I say, with all modesty, that it is impossible, even at this date, to give a direct answer to those questions. The National Advisory Board for Canada already has be-

fore it the entire report of the engineers, with the appendices. It already has before it, if not in form, at least in substance, the very extended reports of what we call the Interdepartmental Committees. But beyond that there is something which I believe ought to be investigated before the Government gives an answer to the proposal. What is that? The economic question, will it pay Canada? We have some statistics, but statistics do not always prove the proper thing. I mean by that that statistics can be so arranged that they show misdirected energy. We have in Canada very large shippers of grain. So far as the growing of wheat is concerned, Canada is the granary of the world. My own view is that before an attempt is made to answer the United States the leading shippers, who make the grain trade their life work, should be called before the Advisory Board or the Government to give their views. Will it pay the country to carry out the proposal? Shall we get a return for the money expended? We export so many million bushels of grain, and so many million bushels go down the St. Lawrence, at such a cost. How many more millions would go down the St. Lawrence if it were deepened? And what would be the saving? The Government or the Advisory Board ought to call the representatives of the railways, in which we have so much money invested, and ask them: "Are you interested in this? Give us your views." They ought to call in also the owners of shipping. It has been said, you know, honourable gentlemen, in many places, that the owners of the ocean shipping would not permit their vessels to go up as we are prophesying they will some time; that it would not pay them to permit their vessels to go up into the fresh water for so many miles, taking so many chances and spending so much time. These men should be called before the Government or before the Advisory Board and asked whether, if the project is carried out, they will utilize it, or whether it is practicable to utilize it, and, if so, what benefit it will be to the people of Canada. There are a thousand other questions that might be asked.

That relates to the question of navigation, with which the Dominion is primarily concerned. Then as to power, we have a great deal of technical knowledge on what the development would cost, and how much power could be developed, but have we a market anywhere for this power if we spend this money in developing it? Maybe we have; maybe we can induce manufacturers to come from other places if we have cheap power. That is a matter of industrial investigation. I think that is another thing that ought to