

\$12,000,000 to \$17,000,000. There were also increases in Mexico and Central America, the products we sent them being largely newsprint, pulp, automobiles, meats, lumber, flour and fish.

Turning again to the continent of Europe, since the invasion of Norway our business with Sweden has fallen considerably, dropping from \$5,216,000 to \$2,211,000. Our exports to Portugal increased from \$124,000 to \$1,000,000, and to Spain from a paltry \$23,000 to about \$500,000. It is perhaps well to say here that we have a very definite assurance, as definite as any such assurance can be, that none of the commodities exported to these continental countries reach enemy countries.

But, with all this, wheat is still our great problem. I listened with great interest to what the honourable senator from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Hayden) said last night as to what might be done, although his suggestions were necessarily not very definite. I think it the duty of the National Research Council to do all it can to find new uses for wheat.

This country of eleven million people has cause for pride and satisfaction in the continued increase of our international trade, and therefore of its enormous volume, which is so necessary to the conduct of the war.

And now, honourable senators, I will for just a few moments deal with the question of the St. Lawrence development, in conformity with a duty which has been entrusted to me by the honourable leader of the Senate (Hon. Mr. Dandurand). As everyone knows, this question has been a controversial one for a great many years. I do not purpose entering into any controversy now, and I bespeak the patience of the House if I mention some matters which perhaps are as well known to honourable senators as they are to myself. There are, of course, two aspects to the St. Lawrence development: one, that of navigation, and the other, that of power. It is admitted now that whereas there has always been a considerable difference of opinion about the value of a deepened waterway all along the St. Lawrence, there can be no doubt of the necessity of developing electrical energy there.

The difficulties in connection with the whole matter have been manifold. One has arisen, as I have indicated, because of differences of opinion in Canada itself, perhaps more especially in the province of Quebec than elsewhere, as to the advisability and the need of a deepened waterway. There has also been complication because of the international character of the proposed scheme. Further, the separate jurisdiction of the federal and provincial governments has perhaps made the matter more difficult than it otherwise would

Hon. Mr. EULER.

have been. Another factor that entered into the case was the diversion of water by the city of Chicago. Finally, there was the problem of the heavy financial commitments that would be necessary in the building of the waterway.

In Ontario we have a great public ownership development called the Hydro-Electric system. Whatever the views of some honourable members of the Senate may be as to the value of public ownership—and I am not going to debate that at the moment—there can be little doubt that the publicly owned Hydro-Electric power development in Ontario has been of immense value to the people of the province. If I may say so, the district from which I come takes a great deal of pride in the fact, which may be known to most honourable members, that the original suggestion for development of Niagara power in the province of Ontario came from a resident of the county of Waterloo, Mr. D. B. Detweiler, a man of Mennonite extraction, whose forefathers migrated to that part of Canada from Pennsylvania. Mr. E. W. B. Snyder, also of that district, joined with Mr. Detweiler and they pressed constantly for action. Finally the great undertaking was carried to completion and success by the late Sir Adam Beck. Further honour is due to that section of the country because of the fact that the first suggestion for deepening the St. Lawrence also came from Mr. Detweiler. And, if honourable members will pardon a personal reference, I may say that the very first public meeting called to arouse interest in developing the St. Lawrence waterway was held in the city of Kitchener and presided over by the mayor of that city, who happened to be myself. A great deal of water has flowed under the bridges and through the rapids of the St. Lawrence since that time, and the waterways subject has been discussed very often.

As honourable members know, Canada has for years had a canal system with a depth of 14 feet. In 1929 a convention was signed with the United States, providing for a certain further diversion on both sides of the border, and also for preservation of the scenic beauties at Niagara Falls. That convention did not become effective, because it was not approved by the United States Senate. Nothing further was done until 1932, when another treaty with the United States was signed, providing for a waterway 27 feet in depth and the development of some 2,000,000 horse-power of electrical energy. That treaty received the support of a majority in the United States Senate, but was not ratified, it having failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote. There the matter has rested,