

the statement of Julius Barnes that ten cents a bushel would be saved to the farmers of the western states and of western Canada. Consequently this question is of particular importance to the farmers of the West. That is the statement I started with, and I think the House will agree with me, because transportation rates on wheat are a direct tax upon the farmers who grow it.

But in addition to that saving of wheat, the building of this deep waterway would mean a saving of freight charges on all freight transported from the East to the West to the head of the Great Lakes or the reverse because package freight is increased in cost by the shipping charges, and also coal and various other commodities. I think it was my hon. friend, the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie), who pointed out in the course of his speech last year that coal from Nova Scotia, by virtue of these canals, might be shipped up even to the head of the lakes. I believe that is a possibility. To-day Ontario and Quebec get most of their coal from Pennsylvania. The building of these canals would facilitate traffic on the Great Lakes to such an extent that there would be a very good opportunity of coal from Nova Scotia being used as far west as Toronto, and even perhaps as far west as Fort William and Winnipeg, Pennsylvania coal being now used in Winnipeg and a short distance beyond.

Let me point out also another important fact. It deals particularly with the remarks of my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) who preceded me. It is estimated that one-third of the population living in the States is tributary to the Great Lakes. In other words, it is claimed by the advocates of this scheme that forty million of the population live in those states which, so to speak, are tributary to the Great Lakes. Much of the wheat and other traffic of those states is tributary to the Great Lakes. It is also claimed that seventy per cent of the foodstuffs and raw material produced in the Union are produced in those states. In Canada half of the population may be regarded as feeding the Great lakes, by their traffic, because Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have a little more than four million people among them; and those four provinces containing half the population of Canada, roughly, and I should say giving more than half of our production, are tributary to the Great Lakes.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. VIEN: If I may interrupt my hon. friend? What advantage would accrue to the maritime provinces and to Quebec, which would be called upon to contribute to a large extent to the expenditure involved, by the construction of the canal?

Mr. MANION: I might reply by asking my hon. friend: What advantage to the prairie provinces was the building of the Intercolonial railway, for example?

Mr. VIEN: The answer is quite obvious—the prairie provinces had not much to say when the Intercolonial railway was built.

Mr. MANION: That is quite true, but they have contributed to its deficits just the same, I notice. However, I will try to answer my hon. friend's question. There may not be any direct benefit to the city of Montreal or the province of Quebec except to this extent, that if these proposals I am laying before the House, and which the advocates of this scheme support, are correct, the whole of Canada would be built up, and in that way Montreal and Quebec would profit also. But before my hon. friend came in I had pointed out that we cannot govern this country in sections. We cannot take every proposition that comes before the House and prove that every section of the country is going to be equally benefited by it before we consider its merits.

Mr. VIEN: It must be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MANION: It might be for the general advantage of Canada, perhaps, but not for the particular advantage of Montreal.

Mr. McMASTER: Impossible!

Mr. MANION: I advanced arguments before my hon. friend came in that I do not want to go over again in regard to the effect of this undertaking upon Montreal and Quebec. So far as the maritime provinces are concerned, anything that builds up this country will also enure to the advantage of those provinces: and of Quebec also, and as I was arguing a moment ago coal might be brought by this route as far as the head of the lakes—I do not claim that that would actually happen—and to that extent Nova Scotia would get the benefit.

My hon. friend from Nipissing spoke of the Georgian Bay canal route. There is no doubt that good arguments could be