

Class 5e—Canadian Light and Power Company, old Beauharnois Canal near Ste. Timothée

The old Beauharnois Canal on the south side of the St. Lawrence is used as a head race or waterway for the power plant situated near Ste. Timothée, Que., the intake being near Valleyfield. The Canal has been abandoned for navigation purposes for many years and is now used entirely for power, diverting water from Lake St. Francis for that purpose and discharging it into the St. Lawrence River near the foot of Cedars Rapids.

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. There is one that I would like to ask you about, and that is the Grand Falls one on the St. John River. You are familiar with that, are you not?—
A. Yes, I am.

Q. There were two Orders in Council, were there not, affecting that?—
A. Yes.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Is that an international stream?—A. Not at the point of development. It becomes an international stream about two miles above and the works raise the water in the international section.

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. And consequently had to be approved by the International Joint Commission?—A. Yes.

Q. The approval of this scheme as I understand it, was asked for by the New Brunswick Power Commission first, was it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And approval had been granted them?—A. Yes.

Q. The New Brunswick Power Project was subsequently taken over by the International Paper Company, was it not?—A. By the St. Lawrence River Power Company.

Q. Which is a subsidiary?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it carried out as first approved?—A. No. They made a change in it. The scheme was to throw a dam across the St. John River just above the falls, at Grand Falls, with sluice gates to regulate the level of the river, and the water was to be taken through an intake which immediately up-stream on the south side abutted on the dam. The scheme as built, and as subsequently approved, changed that intake about its own length further up-stream.

Q. Changed the intake?—A. Changed the intake up-stream approximately the length of the original intake.

Q. Change the intake upstream?—A. Yes approximately the length of the original intake. The development originally was from that point on an alternative; they showed an alternative on an overland canal to carry the water to the brink of the declivity and then pass it down through penstocks to the power house. The alternative to that was a tunnel, and they finally constructed the tunnel.

Q. Now, did you submit to the Department of Justice the question whether it was necessary to go through the formalities under the Navigable Waters Protection Act?—A. Yes, and we were advised that if the change was not a material one the approval was not necessary.

Q. And, in fact, they were not required to get that approval?—A. No.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. You have been listening to the evidence since you gave your evidence before?—A. Most of it.