

by those companies. But is it not possible under this section that the Board may decide that 10,000 cubic feet may be taken on one side and not on the other?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I ask, is it not possible? Is it not possible for the United States to put in there weirs, or dams or other works, in order to divert water into certain channels to secure the scenic beauty that is required, and that the water may be taken in such a way and in such places that it will be on one side or another of the river?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: My honourable friend says no; but what reason has he for saying no?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: What is the good of making a Treaty if they are going against it?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The Treaty does not say explicitly that the same quantity of water shall be taken on each side of the river.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Ten thousand and ten thousand.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: No; it simply says a maximum of 10,000 cubic feet per second may be taken on each side of the river. It does not say it must be. It does not say that if 5,000 cubic feet are taken on one side, 5,000 must be taken on the other. What it does say is:

The Board shall have complete supervision and control over the additional waters permitted to be diverted, with power to diminish or suspend such additional diversions.

May I ask again, is it possible that such a condition might arise?

Hon. Mr. REID: By way of an answer to the honourable gentleman, I shall read clause 6, stopping first at the place where I think he should have stopped:

The Board shall have complete supervision and control over the additional waters permitted to be diverted. . . .

Now, if you stop right there—and there is a comma there—you will see that the Board has complete supervision and control over the additional waters permitted to be diverted. Then it goes on:

—with power to diminish or suspend such additional diversions.

I submit that the first part of the clause gives the Board complete supervision and control over the additional waters permitted to be diverted.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That is over the diversion.

Hon. Mr. REID: The clause gives them the power to lease it, or export it, or do as they like with it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would draw the attention of this House to the fact that these proposed works are to be an experiment, from which the engineers expect certain results. In order to test the extent to which water may be diverted it is provided that during certain months of the year a further diversion may be made to the right or to the left. Honourable gentlemen must not forget that continuously since 1909 there has been a great diversion on both sides, under the supervision of the Niagara Board of Control, which has records of the total hourly diversion of water each way.

All the water comes from the same stream. The works may be modified so as to throw a little more water on one side than the other with a view to the beauty of the Falls, which is the main object, as the honourable gentleman from Saltcoats (Hon. Mr. Calder) has said. The purpose of the additional water is that an experiment may be made. But that additional water comes from a common source; it does not run on each side separately. The end in view is a mutually satisfactory distribution of the water over each side.

It may be decided after an experiment of a year or two that some further weirs should be put in. But they would not prevent each country from withdrawing 10,000 feet under the control of the Niagara Board of Control, which keeps minute records in order to see that the Treaty is lived up to by the two countries. The Treaty has been observed honourably and to the satisfaction of both countries, and I do not see that by granting the Board further control of 10,000 cubic feet per second on each side we are altering in the least the obligations of its members to their respective countries or to the two countries. The Board is composed of two Canadians and two Americans; so we are sufficiently protected in equality of representation. Under these conditions I do not see that there is any reason to fear that power will be transported from one side to the other. We all know that under the Treaty of 1909 Canada is allowed 36,000 cubic feet per second, and the United States 20,000 cubic feet. The proposal is to add 10,000 cubic feet temporarily for seven years, and during the winter months only.

We have felt completely protected since 1909 in the administration of the diversion. Why should we feel differently regarding a provision that simply would increase the ratio?