

country which would enlarge its water-ways and develop them to the greatest extent so as to secure economy in transportation which tends to the prosperity of the country will have done for its citizens, its producers and its consumers alike the greatest possible good. I say then that this Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, which is an old scheme, should have received more serious consideration at the hands of the government of the day and the parliament of this country.

What did Sir John Macdonald say in his time when I brought up my motion in that connection. He said :

The Ottawa ship canal and the Pacific Railway must be constructed. No voice will be raised against the great national work which will open up the western states and colonies to the seaboard.

He put that scheme hand in hand with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, Sir, we come to Mr. Alexander Mackenzie and what did he say :

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any route upon the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-west to the Atlantic ocean.

These men were sound in their views. They looked at the situation as statesmen, not from a sectional, a selfish, or a party standpoint. They looked at it in a national spirit, and that is the way that such questions should be viewed. Any member in this house who, looking at that great stretch of inland water navigation that nature has placed there for man to develop, and considering the difficulty that now exists in moving the bulky products, the cereals of the North-west to the seaboard, says that this Georgian Bay canal should not be constructed does not understand the situation. If we had a 20-foot water-way vessels could be employed of 18-6 feet draught, and carrying some 8,000 tons of freight from Lake Superior to the seaboard at a dollar a ton, or \$8,000 a cargo, so that we would have a rate of three cents a bushel on wheat. Is there any other stretch of water navigation or railway line that can compete with that? No, Sir, there is not and cannot be. Nature has done almost everything for us and it is left for us to do the rest.

Then, Sir, let us consider the value of the water-powers along that river. You talk about protection stimulating manufactures. Why, Sir, these water-powers will be the greatest stimulants to the manufacturing industries that we could have. Two hundred and fifty thousand horsepower can be developed on that line. See what that will mean, think of the pulp mills and grist mills that will be erected between here and Mattawa. We can have all kinds of machinery run by electricity. That is what the effect of this construction will be. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I am talking common sense, I am talking facts. I am for business every time. I am

Mr. MURRAY.

not a lawyer, I do not study up what I am going to say. I say it from my heart, I am sincere and I believe that if there is one matter more than another which should receive the attention of Canada it is this very important question of improving the water-ways. This will not be a canal; it will be a series of stretches of river navigation. Look how the ships will be sheltered, no danger, no risk at all, they will be sheltered from the winds and the storms to which they would be exposed on the great lakes. Then, looking at it from a military standpoint, we will have a system of inland navigation which will be of great value in connection with a system of national defence and a great protection to our shipping. From every standpoint I say the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal should be constructed, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House to take up this matter. In 1898 a report of a Senate Committee was published on this project. That is one thing for which I give the Senate credit—I do not give them credit for much, because I consider the Senate a useless piece of government machinery—but I do give them credit for giving that question some attention. I asked for a copy of that report, and not being able to get one, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Printing Committee, asking him to have a number printed for further circulation. In the course of his address the other day my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) made reference to this question. He made a personal inspection of the French river, and was instrumental in having a survey and an approximate estimate of the cost of a canal on that river prepared. He was very enthusiastic on that matter. I accompanied him from Pembroke down the Ottawa to Arnprior, and naturally, at Bryson and other places where he stopped, people were anxious to meet him, and they gathered in large numbers. The hon. gentleman then gave the impression that the construction of the canal was to go on immediately, that surveys were to be made along the route and the whole project was to be taken up. I am sorry to say that the other evening when he spoke he did not go quite as warmly into the subject, although he was very much in favour of improving our water-ways. He referred to the St. Lawrence. He strongly favoured spending money along the St. Lawrence, and at Montreal. I did not like the ring of his speech when I compared it with the enthusiastic manner in which he spoke to my constituents when I accompanied him through Pontiac.

I am satisfied that the hon. leader of the government, although he has not pronounced himself as strongly as did some former premiers of this country. Sir John Macdonald and Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, has foresight enough and has statesmanship enough to see the necessity of going