had been manufacturing public opinion for the last two years in regard to the Georgian Bay Canal, and that immense private interests were pushing the scheme. The Government, he said, was being forced to let the country in for the scheme, and everything else was kept in the background.

As a result, a resolution was passed, providing that the society would urge the Government to study carefully the various schemes affecting the St. Lawrence and that a comprehensive report be issued on the subject before committing the country either to any scheme for damning the river or for ennal transportation. The resolution was moved by Professor Herdt of McGill, and seconded by Mr. Kennedy."

THE ST. LAWRENCE-WELLAND DEEP WATERWAY IS NOT AN "INTERNATIONAL CONVENIENCE," BUT A CANADIAN NATIONAL NECESSITY.

In the succeeding portion of this pamphlet, reply will be made to some of Mr. Forwards' misleading and unsound nrguments, especially concerning the advantage which would be drawn by Canada and the United States respectively, from a St. Lawrence-Welland Deep Waterway. Such a waterway, as Mr. Forward and the interests which he serves, well know, and unguardedly admit, must come. It will come, however, not as Mr. Forward says, because it is an international convenience, but because it is a national Canadian necessity. The interests of the United States in ohtaining a deep waterway through the Lakes and St. Lawrence, in order to carry their own grain and traffic by that route direct from Duluth, Chicago and the Western Lakes to Europe, is indeed such that Senator Townsend and Gen. Bixby urged investigation, and Gen. Bixby has even suggested that the U. S. should contribute towards the cost of the proposed development in Canada, expecting in return only the opportunity to reach the ocean hy means of the resultant deep water channel for the largest ships. Canada should not, however, accept such assistance, because it is neither desirable nor necessary. Senator Townsend, Chairman of U. S. Senate Committee of the Coast and Insular Cirvey, estimates the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence development at approximately 150 millions. value of resulting water powers would repay more than twice that expenditure, if necessary. It should be noted, moreover, with respect to this American estimate, that the U. S. has constructed the Panama Canal not at twice or more of its estimated cost, but at less than the original estimate. The gentlemen from the Upper Ottawa, the district especially interested in the proposed Georgian Bay Canal, have set us quite nnother pace, worthy of consideration at this juncture, when they are urging upon the community their pet project at an estimated cost of 100 millions. At an investigation held by the Public Works Department of Ottawa in 1912, concerning the construction of a dam on a tributary of the Upper Ottawa at the outlet of Lake Temiskaming, Mr. Coutlee, C. E., a member of the Board of Georgian Bay Canal Engineers, testified that the estimates for its construction were \$77,000, hut that \$350,000 had been expended and the dam was still not completed. If the above dam be a criterion, the real cost of the Georgian Bay project would be many times the original estimate, and for this expenditure the Canadian public would have on its hands an unfinished "serpentine," which, if it were finished, navigation experts say no sane captain would