

horse-power; they pay from \$1.50 to 50 cents.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have not the document, but I am sure my hon. friend is not correct.

Mr. GERMAN. I know I am.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think 25 cents is the amount paid for a certain portion. However, whether it is 25 cents or \$1.50, it is a very small amount per horse-power per annum, that I think the hon. gentleman will admit. What I am pointing out is that if this government enter into a bargain with the United States government by treaty or otherwise, to limit the amount that can be withdrawn from the river for all time, they will very seriously handicap the industries of the province of Ontario, the traction companies that are dependent on that for their electrical power to carry on their work and the steam railways, which in the very near future may electrify their services as well, and may give us the benefit of more rapid service and more up-to-date equipment. I think this government will be doing a very serious injustice and I trust that this recommendation of the waterways commission will not be carried out without the most serious consideration on the part of this government and a due regard to what it means to the province of Ontario. I believe the recommendations in many respects are correct. I am quite willing to yield to them that navigation is certainly under the federal control, that this country has a right to control so far as the navigation of the Niagara river is concerned; but I contend that if the power companies continue to withdraw water from the Niagara river at the same places as they are now it will not affect navigation one iota because they are taking the water from below the crest of the rapids and wherever the water is withdrawn from below the crest it cannot affect the level of the navigable portion of the river. If water is withdrawn from above the crest the level may be affected to an extent that will seriously affect navigation. The same thing would apply to the level of Lake Erie; it cannot be seriously affected so long as the power companies continue to withdraw water from below the crest of the rapid, or if it is affected at all it must be to an infinitesimal degree, and therefore I think the argument that navigation is to be interfered with is not valid.

I believe the principle embodied in the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice is a very good one. I am rather sorry in many respects that it is being withdrawn, but I trust the withdrawal is only temporary. The principle embodied in the Bill might be a very great safeguard in the near future, if the present conditions continue, and especially if we reach the limit

of withdrawal of water from the Niagara river. The position so far as I understand it is about this, that under the existing agreements so long as the power companies at present in the field, supply the present needs of Ontario which are comparatively limited, they are at liberty to export to the United States a very large amount of power that they are going to develop and in fact I think in the case of the Ontario Power Company almost all the power generated could be exported under existing conditions.

I want to point out to the minister the position that Ontario will be in. We have at present these three companies on the ground. Some of them have their works completed and others nearly so. Suppose they say that they are now delivering only 25 per cent of their output to the parts of Ontario that are within transmission distance of Niagara Falls and that they now propose to export the balance of their development to the United States and to bind themselves perhaps for 20 years to sell that power to the United States at a set figure; our wants in the meantime may increase rapidly, I believe they will, and in that case we would have only 25 per cent of the power developed on our side while 75 per cent would be going over the river, and under the bargain or treaty or arrangement with the United States we would be perfectly powerless because under this we would say that no further franchises could be granted on the Niagara river. We would be simply tied up to the small portion of power we are using now and all the rest of it would be exported to the United States, while our industries, our great railways and traction companies which are multiplying their demands, and will do so more rapidly as time advances, will not be able to get power from Niagara or from the level of Lake Erie at the escarpment at Welland, which is as good a site for development as Niagara Falls and would not disturb the scenic effect. But wherever you withdraw the water from the lake you interfere to a certain extent with the level of the lake; it is the same as in the case of the Chicago Drainage Canal, which I think is taking about 10,000 cubic feet a second now.

Mr. HYMAN. It is taking not quite 25 per cent of that amount.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is taking only about 2,500?

Mr. HYMAN. Something like that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Perhaps it is gallons I should have said instead of cubic feet. I think I have seen it stated that it is withdrawing 10,000 gallons or 10,000 cubic feet. What I want to point out is that whether it is gallons or cubic feet, whether it is 2,500 or 10,000 it is withdrawing water that would naturally go over Niagara Falls.