

The hon. gentleman complains that I misrepresented and continued to misrepresent the amount of water taken by the Chicago drainage canal. Well, I contend that that water is just as much taken from our river as if it were drawn from the Niagara Falls. It is drawn from the lake which feeds the Niagara river, and if not taken by this canal would go over the falls. Therefore we are justified in estimating not only the quantity which the Americans take from the Niagara river direct but what they take by the Chicago drainage canal. Let me quote from the supplementary report:

At Chicago the Americans have completed a drainage canal which, when fully utilized, will consume 10,000 cubic feet of water per second.

They do not say how much water they are taking but they say that when that canal is fully utilized, it will be capable of taking 10,000 cubic feet per second. That quantity, I submit, you have to add to the water they are taking from the Niagara river. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to show that Canadians are getting the advantage over the Americans as regards the amount withdrawn from the river. The Americans, he says, are only withdrawing 17,500 cubic feet per second against our 35,000 cubic feet. So that we are getting about double. But is the hon. the minister aware that about five-sixths of the water going over the falls is on the Canadian side. The American falls are almost dry at present, and five-sixths is the estimate of the quantity of water going over on the Canadian side. That is a wise provision of nature by which she has thrown her forces in our direction, so that Providence evidently intended that the province of Ontario should have the benefit of the greater volume of that river. If the hon. gentleman proposes that we are only to take 35,000 cubic feet because the Americans take 17,000 cubic feet, he is throwing away a great part of our advantage. The natural fall of the river, the depth of the water, and the amount going over the Falls, is almost entirely on the Canadian side.

Mr. HYMAN. Is there anything to prevent the Americans going further above the Falls, where they have considerably the larger portion of the river on their side, and carrying the water down to the Falls and developing the power there?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Waterways Commission say that navigation shall not be interfered with, and if the Americans took the water above the rapids, they interfere with the level of the river required for navigation. But if they took it from below the crest of the rapids, that would not interfere with navigation. A few words with regard to the present franchises. I submit they will be vastly enhanced in value if you say that no future development shall

take place on that river. Once the companies that have these franchises are convinced they have all that is to be given, they will be in a position to put up their prices as they like. You will therefore be putting a vast lever in their hands if you say that no other company or combination of municipalities, even the government, shall be allowed to withdraw a further amount from that river for the development of electric power. It seems to me that it is a self evident proposition. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) attacks me severely with regard to the figures I have given. He says that I simply know nothing about the subject when I state the cost at five dollars per horse-power per annum. Let me tell him that the figures I gave are not my own but were taken from the report of the Ontario Power Commission. These figures were prepared by Messrs. Ross & Holgate, engineers of Montreal, who stand as high in engineering work, both hydraulic and electric, as any firm in Canada. They are just as good authorities as the company cited by the hon. gentleman in which he says he has an interest.

Mr. GERMAN. I did not say I had an interest in the company other than a public interest.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand him to say he had an interest in the Ontario Power Company. If he did not, I was mistaken, and gladly withdraw the statement. But whether he said so or not, the figure of \$5 was given us by our engineers. I do not pretend to be an engineer or an electrician or to have any knowledge further than what I have obtained from the researches I have made. My hon. friend says I allow nothing for the investment, for the wear and tear, repairs of works and so on. Let me tell him that everything was provided for, and further that at the end of forty years everything would be fully paid for and would be an asset of the people who put their money into the concern. I was all the time quoting figures given us by the engineers we employed and who were the best men available. But the hon. gentleman, I think, let the cat out of the bag a little by showing he was jealous of Ontario getting the benefit which he thinks should instead be all centered in his own little constituency of Welland. I believe that a meeting was lately held in that constituency which protested against any power being sent out to the municipalities and insisted on everybody wanting power going to the bank of the river. They want to see every industry which requires power from Niagara forced to come to their little constituency or do without it. Perhaps that is the motive which actuates the hon. gentleman in attacking me. I am glad however, that the hon. member agrees with me that it is not desirable this government should enter into