

if he remembers the campaign of 1902, when he was in the county, and I asked very plainly why he opposed this project which was my issue, and he stated that it was for political reasons I proposed it?

Mr. MONK. I never heard of that.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I heard that from the hon. member's own lips.

Mr. MONK. The first vote I gave in this House was in favour of it. And any man who has followed the debates on this subject—by no means so long as debates we have had on some other subjects not so important—or who has read anything of this discussion must know that the project is a useful one in the saving of cost and time in transportation and in every other way. Why, one only needs to know of the fear entertained by the American experts that we will open this route, to know that it will be a good thing for Canada. I do not know that I ever had my hon. friend (Mr. C. A. Wilson) as an adversary. But this I do know—that I never opposed this project.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. The hon. member said I advocated it for political reasons.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it a political matter—certainly, I am not trying to make capital out of it. What I would like to know is: what are we going to do. All that we have heard is, of course, very interesting. To some members of this House, younger than I am, no doubt it is a piece of valuable information when the government say they will give the matter their earnest consideration. But I have heard this often before. Now that the survey is long finished, is nothing going to be done? What is the difficulty? Is it the absence of money? We have a great deal of money for useless, senseless and silly things, such as the navy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. C. A. Wilson) laugh at that? Does he think that the navy is a more urgent and pressing matter than this?

Mr. CONMEE. It is a matter of emergency.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I am in favour of both.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the navy is nearly so urgent as this. The hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) asked what suggestions had not been carried out. Well, this canal idea is one idea of some importance. And the national and free ports that we must have in order to give us a proper place among the nations and that were proposed by the Transportation Commission are of some importance. Another

suggestion was the acquiring of running rights for the Intercolonial to the great lakes in order to give increased facilities and regulate present rates. Has that been attended to? Has anything been done in connection with that matter? Nothing whatever.

Under these circumstances, I rose for the purpose of asking whether this is going to be merely an academic discussion. What new method can the government adopt in order to shelve the matter once more? Is there to be a committee or a commission that is going to pass upon the work—the invaluable work—of the Transportation Commission which has never been disowned by the government, but has been kept in the background? Is there any thing further to be done now that we have the report of a special survey party, the cost of which I think amounts to \$700,000—certainly over \$500,000?—and, as pointed out by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) and others, a complete and thorough report giving the cost and every thing else. What are we going to do? Are we going to allow the Americans to take all this vast commerce away from us, or are we to do that which they dread so much—make an improvement which every one agrees to be urgent and necessary? If the work is to be carried out, when is it to begin? I am sure that my hon. friend from Laval will bear me out when I say that the appropriation cost around Montreal is increasing in fearful proportion yearly. Why should we not begin on that end now? The increase of cost while the work is postponed is going on by hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. The canal may be built in sections, and if the Montreal section is finished soon a great deal of money will be saved. If there is any thing true in this valuable report of the Transportation Commission, it is that, when one-quarter of the cultivatable land of the Northwest is under cultivation and producing wheat, we shall have 800,000,000 bushels a year. The trade of the west will be brought down in ships that can go across the ocean if necessary. They will have return traffic ample for their needs. What is the reason for undue delay? Are we going to have to-day an announcement of the policy of the government and what action it intends to take immediately, or is the question to be shelved again by suggestions such as we have heard, that it is desirable to put it off still further? I say this is a most urgent matter, and I repeat that the suggestion of this Transportation Commission, except in some minor matters, have not been carried out. We must at the present moment spend \$100,000,000 if we intend carrying out the suggestions of this commission in respect to the ports, their freedom and their nationalization. We must absolutely spend \$100,000,000 on this canal; nobody believes that