

Welland Canal and on other portions of the waterway, so that our actual expenditure is to be only about \$50,000,000 in new money, I would remind the House that our experience of the difference between estimated and actual expenditures on railways and other undertakings leaves little doubt that the actual expenditure on the St. Lawrence Waterway would be many times \$50,000,000. To-day Canada is carrying a tremendous burden of public debt and I do not think we can afford to undertake any such expenditure unless the increased revenue to be derived from the traffic to be developed will be sufficient to take care of the added liability.

I do not for one moment believe that ocean liners will make Toronto, or North Bay, or any port on the Great Lakes, a terminal point. In the last twenty years steamship owners have cut down the running time of their boats to ten days and less. Is it reasonable to suppose that they would accept cargoes for delivery at inland ports and thus lengthen the voyage by six, eight or ten days, unless the shipping system of the world were very much changed from what it has been for the past fifty years? I doubt very much the advisability of opening up the great St. Lawrence Waterway—for many hundreds of miles a Canadian river—to a foreign power, and saying, "You shall have the very same rights in this river as we have to-day."

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: Have they not those rights now?

Hon. Mr. BLACK: No. The United States under treaty have certain rights on the St. Lawrence river.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Easements.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: That treaty can be abrogated at any time. But do you suppose that if we entered into the proposed treaty it could ever be abrogated? That would be utterly impossible. By the terms of the proposed treaty they would be joint owners of the St. Lawrence from its mouth to its source.

Honourable members will recall that in the past we have entered into several agreements with our neighbours to the south with respect to waterways. They have never carried out those agreements in the spirit in which we understood them. I am aware that there are reasons for their failure to do so, but they are not reasons which satisfy the Canadian mind. Let me instance the Erie Canal. Many honourable members know more about the construction of that canal than I do, for they live alongside a part of its course. One of the terms of the Erie Canal agreement was

Hon. Mr. BLACK.

that Canadian barges and other boats should have free use of the canal. How long was that agreement observed? I am told that after the first year the State of New York said: "This is a State waterway entirely, and we do not propose to be governed in this respect by the federal authorities. We do not intend to have Canadian barges carrying grain through our canal." As a result our boats were not permitted the free use of the canal.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: May I say that at Whitehall the Americans actually stopped Canadian boats that were going down the Richelieu canal, and they had to unload there.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: That confirms what I have been saying. Then there is the diversion of water from the Great Lakes by the Chicago Drainage Canal. Year in and year out we have heard in this and in the other House that the level of the Great Lakes was being lowered because of the excessive diversion of water. From time to time our Government protested against the diversion. Finally the case was referred to the Supreme Court of the United States and after a lapse of three years the court rendered a decision in our favour. But the diversion still goes on. The State of Illinois laughs at Washington, and Washington laughs at Ottawa. I might mention other unfortunate instances, but I will not trespass further on the patience of the House. I think I have said sufficient to justify my opinion that after these unfortunate experiences it would be unwise to enter into a treaty which would give a foreign power further rights in the St. Lawrence river.

It is stressed by many people that after all improved navigation is not the paramount object in view; that far more important would be the development of electric power in conjunction with the deepening and widening of the waterway. Well, I agree with that. I agree also that there would be enormous quantities of electric power developed by this scheme. I know too, and so does every man within the sound of my voice, as does every intelligent, thinking man in Canada, that we have in this country to-day as much water-power developed as we can use at the present time, and that in certain parts there is more than we can utilize in ten or twenty years, or possibly in three decades. That being so, should we, at a cost of many millions of dollars, develop a quantity of water-power which we obviously cannot use, and which therefore will bring no revenue into this country? If we cannot sell that power to industrial concerns on our own side of the waterway, what will be the result? Obviously there will be a demand on the part of the