

total traffic for the whole year was only some 351,000 tons, in a canal which has a potential capacity of over 8,000,000 tons.

The minister said that the proposal is to erect a dam approximately half way between Chambly and St. Johns. My memory may be wrong or I may have mistakenly judged the height of the bank at that point; I got the location in the department offices at Montreal, and I went to the point where I was informed the dam was to be erected. The banks there perhaps do not exceed 25 or 30 feet; I judged about 25 feet. If a dam erected at that point is to be of any benefit whatever south of St. Johns it would have to be more than 25 feet high. The minister said that approximately half of the Chambly canal locks would be cut out, six locks, and those six locks I presume are equivalent to half the rise from Chambly to St. Johns, which is 80 feet. Therefore if half the locks are going to be cut out that dam would have to be somewhere between 35 and 40 feet high. It would be impossible to erect it with the banks as they are now, if my memory of the height is correct. I cannot grasp at all how a dam at that point can accomplish what is expected of it.

The United States engineers' proposal was to build a dam south of the international boundary, I presume across from Stony Point to Windmill Point—

Mr. DUPUIS: Does the hon. member mean in lake Champlain?

Mr. MacNICOL: North of the main outlet. While it is called river, it is nothing more or less than an extension of the lake, of considerable width. The banks at that point are not high. I presume that is where the minister referred to some flooding taking place during high water, when the lake level was at about 102 feet. The United States engineers proposed to build the dam between Stony Point and Windmill Point. In that way they would control the lake level, and they would not have to ask Canada's permission, as I understand, that water being wholly within the United States.

But in our case if the dam at the point where this government proposes to erect it raises the lake level—although personally I cannot see how it can unless large dykes are built alongside the river—what right have we to raise the level of water in a foreign country? I believe the Prime Minister made a trip to Washington recently, and I presume one of the subjects discussed there, although I am not asking that to be admitted here, may have been the proposal of the Ontario government to pour water into lake Superior from the watershed of Long lake.

The Ontario government decided, it is said, to allow United States lumber interests to dam the Kenagami river and take the water out of Long lake watershed and pour it into lake Superior. If the Ontario government had thought for a moment, they would have known they cannot do any such thing. And in this case, if a dam at the point proposed would have any effect on the level of lake Champlain we could not do it without an international agreement. Perhaps that has been obtained already.

Something was said last night about the traffic on the Champlain canal, and I referred to a submission made by the Montreal chamber of commerce. I should have said the *chambre de commerce*; I presume that is the French-speaking section of the Montreal chamber of commerce. When I got to my room I found that the submission had been presented by Mr. Paul Beique, and had been signed by M. René Morin. I presume they are associated with the *chambre de commerce*. The Montreal *chambre de commerce* submitted a brief in opposition to the proposal to carry a seaway through from the Hudson to the St. Lawrence. Last night the minister pointed out that the proposal he has in mind has nothing to do with the United States proposals, of which the main one was from lake St. Francis to lake Champlain. In discussing that I mentioned the United States figure of \$200,000,000, and when the minister was speaking he gave the cost of what the government had in mind as about \$8,000,000.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, if we decide to reconstruct the Chambly canal.

Mr. MacNICOL: But suppose the final decision should be to carry the 27 to 30 foot canal down the Richelieu river, which is the only canal depth the United States might consider at all, because their proposal is to have no locks at all on the Champlain-Hudson canal, with the exception of two at Northumberland where the boats will drop down to tidewater. To do that, they would have to cut through the height of land to a depth of something like forty-five feet more or less, a foot or two either way depending on the height to which they could raise lake Champlain. If the channel went directly north from lake Champlain to Sorel at a depth of 27 to 30 feet I question whether it would cost much less than the estimated cost from lake St. Francis to lake Champlain, \$200,000,000, because between those two lakes it would run across a more or less level country, and only two locks would be required very close to lake Champlain. On the other hand, if a canal should be constructed