

Whenever you can lower the insurance or the freight rates by deepening the St. Lawrence, by lighting it, by enlarging the harbours—every time you can take a cent off the cost of the transportation of the produce of this country, that is a benefit to the men who raise the crops. While I give every credit to my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture, for the steps he has taken and is still taking, in order to benefit the producers of this country, that is only a minor matter as compared with a wise expenditure of the public money in improving and cheapening the lines of transportation, and in this way giving our farmers money far in excess of what they would get had not these additional facilities been provided out of our public revenue.

And again at page 2154:

That subsidy was given not to build the road alone, but to secure to the people of the west the great boon of having a reduction in freight rates of three cents a hundred pounds for all time to come. In addition to that, lower rates were to be given on goods imported into that country, coal oil, agricultural implements, &c., so that, taking these things into consideration and remembering that the money has been paid back—although of course it went to farmers it was still paid back—and on that one item in four years there has been an immense relief to these people. I give it as an illustration of all the other expenditures. By wise expenditures of that kind you are benefiting the country, you increase your revenue, you have one of the greatest resources of the prosperity of this country.

If that is true of a slight reduction of freight in the Northwest, how much more would it apply to a great work of this kind which would benefit not only the farmer, but the coal producer of the east, the lumbermen of Ontario, the mines of Ontario, and a great many manufactories which would undoubtedly be started along the line of this canal on being furnished with cheap power?

I would also like to call the attention of the House briefly to the fact that, although ten years is supposed to be required for the completion of this canal, the completion of the various parts of it would be of immediate benefit to the country. Several surveys of that section of the canal between French river village and Lake Nipissing have been made. The Canadian Pacific railway made two such surveys and Mr. J. W. Fraser made a survey in 1900 under this government. His estimate of the cost of completing the canal from the mouth of French river to Lake Nipissing was \$4,200,000. It is true, later reports have increased this estimate, but this was largely because of the estimate being based on a wider and deeper canal with more spent for elevators, lighting, &c. This section of the canal, if built, would at once be a paying investment, as it would open up a large section of country. The Pickerel river, the Wolf, the Rainy and the South river, the Widow river, the Sturgeon and the Wanipitae are all tributaries of this section. Much of

the timber of this region would be made marketable, mines opened up, and coal delivered by boat much nearer to the great mining districts of northern Ontario, which at present bring in coal by rail from Fort Erie.

We have some very fine harbours on Lake Nipissing, and some of the best water-powers in Ontario are on the course of the French river, or what is called the French river, because it is really a succession of beautiful lake expansions. These water-powers could be cheaply developed, and no doubt the power would be very quickly utilized. A good deal is being said at the present time about deepening the Welland canal, and while I believe that both those canals will be necessary in a few years, hence, the deepening of the Welland canal at the present time would only lessen the trouble and not remove it; as a matter of fact, it would only remove the distributing point from Port Colborne to Kingston or Prescott. I was somewhat surprised recently to find a circular being distributed through Ontario by advocates of the deepening of the Welland canal. These men undertake to show why the Georgian Bay canal should not be built, and I would call the attention of the House to one or two of the reasons they put forward. In the first clause they say:

A canal 442 miles long for a 10,000 ton ship following the bends in the Ottawa river is enough to deter the ordinary lake captain.

Now, regarding the building of this canal, there has been a good deal of misconception on the part of some people in Canada. This canal, instead of being 440 miles long, according to the most recent survey, which is a very complete one, will only be 28 miles long, on the whole course of the water-way, including the locks themselves. We have some 66 miles of water course which has to be deepened or straightened, but the balance, some 346 miles, is entirely free from any obstacle of any kind. The route will really be much safer for navigation than any part of the great lakes. Another objection that was urged is that there would be no return cargoes for vessels using this canal. But as I have already pointed out, there is no logical or any other reason why the province of Ontario should not use Nova Scotia coal when they can get it. As a matter of fact, boats using the St. Lawrence route to-day up to Port Colborne have very little freight back. The return cargo amounts to practically nothing, unless they go across to Lake Erie and load coal at Cleveland. Another point is raised, which also has been touched upon by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White). This circular says:

That northern country generally freezes up about the 5th to the 10th of November, while