

of traffic, and for that reason it offers opposition. And, in Canada, places like North Bay oppose the proposition on the grounds that have been mentioned, while Montreal so far has taken an attitude antagonistic to it. I do not believe that Montreal would suffer if this undertaking were carried through. Directly it might do that city some little harm, but indirectly it would undoubtedly do it a great deal of good, inasmuch as it would help to build up Canada. And anything that builds up the Dominion cannot possibly help benefiting a magnificent city like Montreal. In any case, suppose it did to some extent harm Montreal in Canada, or Buffalo or New York in the United States, that would not be a sufficient reason for abandoning a proposition of this kind. This country cannot be governed on sectional lines; it must be governed from the standpoint of what is good for the country as a whole, even if occasionally some particular section suffers in consequence. The question is of great importance to Ontario and the prairie provinces, because Ontario is directly adjacent to the Great Lakes, and the prairie provinces grow the wheat which goes over the lakes and upon which, it is claimed, a great saving in transportation would be secured if the canal were completed.

To realize the importance of the lake traffic of this country, let us for a moment consider the tonnage that passes through three great canals that are known to all of us—the Panama canal, the Suez canal, and the Soo canal. Taking the 1920 returns, the traffic passing through the Panama canal amounted to nine million tons; that passing through the Suez canal to twelve million tons; and that passing through the American and Canadian Soo canals to seventy-nine million tons. In other words, the traffic passing through the Soo canals between Canada and the United States was almost four times the combined traffic passing through those other two world-famous canals. The value of that seventy-nine million tons of traffic was over \$1,000,000,000. We do not realize the importance of our waterways until we make some comparisons of that kind, and therefore I have made them for the benefit of hon. members who are doing me the courtesy of listening to my remarks.

I might point out also that our harbours, starting with St. John and Halifax in the east, and going to Victoria and Vancouver in the west, and taking in Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Fort William and Port Arthur, are practically fully developed,

and it would not take very much additional expenditure on any one of them to meet the most exacting shipping requirements of to-day. So that that is not an expense of any very great amount in this scheme.

For the special benefit of my hon. friends to the left, I would draw attention to some facts in regard to the production of wheat and other grains in this country. They know that roughly 300,000,000 bushels of wheat are grown in the prairie provinces annually, most of which goes to the head of the lakes, for shipment by boat either to Port Colborne or Buffalo. If shipped to Port Colborne the wheat is usually transferred to smaller boats or to freight cars, and taken down to Montreal, in each case at considerable expense. If it goes to Buffalo—and sixty-five per cent of it in the past has been going there—it is usually transferred to small boats on the Erie canal and taken down to New York for export.

Now, it is claimed by those who are supporting it that by the building of this St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal at least five cents per bushel would be saved in transportation charges on the wheat of western Canada. That means not only on the wheat exported, but it would be saved also on the wheat that is used within Canada, because all hon. members know that the price for the wheat of the world, including Canada, is set in Liverpool, that being the world market. So if you saved five cents per bushel on transportation, naturally that saving should go to the farmers of the West. Julius Barnes, whom all hon. members know by reputation, the former head of the American Wheat Board, has stated that this scheme would save ten cents to the farmers of western Canada and the western states. I could quote his exact words, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. He has estimated that there is lost annually to the farmers of the western states through the lack of this deep-water communication from the head of the lakes \$200,000,000. In other words, he figures out that more than the American cost of the building of this canal is lost every year to American farmers. If you take 300,000,000 bushels of wheat as being roughly the annual production of the prairie provinces a saving of five cents a bushel in the aggregate would amount to \$15,000,000 every year to our western farmers. But that saving of five cents a bushel is a conservative estimate. Herbert Hoover, an international figure to-day, agrees with