

THE OBJECTION THAT CANADA WOULD LOSE HER INDEPENDENT CONTROL OF NAVIGATION ON THE ST. LAWRENCE IS FALLACIOUS.

The feasibility of the St. Lawrence-Welland development, and the reasonableness of its cost are admitted even by the interests opposing its construction. For want of better arguments, these interests bring against that enterprise fallacious objections, such as the plea that Canada, in case dams were constructed for the purpose of such development in the St. Lawrence, would have no independent control of navigation in her portion of the boundary waters of that river. The fact is that by the erection of such permanent dams in this section the international situation now prevailing at Sault Ste. Marie would simply be duplicated, without disadvantage either to Canada or to the United States.

At Sault Ste. Marie the rapids constitute a natural barrier to navigation in the stream which forms the international boundary from Lake Superior to Lake Huron. Permanent dams in the St. Lawrence would constitute artificial barriers in a part of that stream forming the international boundary from Lake Ontario eastward. At the Soo each of the two countries has locks upon its own side; on the Michigan side, two are completed, a third is approaching completion and a fourth is projected; on the Canadian, one is completed and a second is planned for early construction. Each of the respective countries controls the locks on its own side and has, therefore, independent control of navigation at that point. In the St. Lawrence also, the respective countries would each have a lock or locks on its own side, and they would, therefore, each have independent control of navigation at these points in the St. Lawrence just as they now have in the St. Mary's River at the Soo.

Division of water for power purposes, in the case of the construction of such dams in the St. Lawrence, would be by international treaty or agreement, and such a treaty or agreement would naturally be a duplication of arrangements already in existence between the two countries regarding a division of power developed from boundary waters at Niagara Falls, the Soo, and Fort Francis in Ontario.

THE SUGGESTED DANGER OF CANADIAN TRAFFIC DIVERGING TO THE PORT OF NEW YORK IS A GEOGRAPHICAL IMPOSSIBILITY.

Another bugaboo raised by the interests in opposition to the development of an ocean waterway to the head of the lakes is the suggestion frequently made that, if the Welland Canal were enlarged in harmony with such a development, the United States would construct a 21 or 30 foot canal from Oswego, or some other point along such waterway, to the Hudson River; and thus would offer a heavier competition than by the present 12 foot Erie Barge Canal from Buffalo for the carriage of Canadian freight to Europe via the port of New York instead of Montreal.

This objection is always made on the gratuitous or silent assumption by the objectors, that a corresponding enlargement in the St. Lawrence would not be made. Such an assumption, it is scarcely necessary to say, is wholly fallacious. Of the entire deep waterway, the enlargement in the St. Lawrence is, in point of fact, the part which is easiest of all