

Ruisseau LeBlanc—dredging, \$22,500.
 Ruisseau Pariseau—contribution towards dredging, the balance of cost to be borne by the province, \$15,000.
 St. Andre de Kamouraska—headblock, \$14,600.
 St. Cuthbert—wharf, \$2,200.
 St. Charles de Caplan—wharf extension, \$25,000.
 St. Chrysostome—protection walls, \$12,900.
 St. Denis—wharf reconstruction, \$4,650.
 St. Edouard de Fabre—protection wall, \$11,000.
 St. Etienne de Malbaie—wharf improvements, \$5,500.
 St. Felicite—wharf extension, \$54,400.
 St. Flavie—wharf extension, \$20,500.
 St. Godfroy—wharf repairs, \$8,200.
 St. Ignace de Loyola—protection wall, \$15,000.
 Ste. Jeanne d'Arc—wharf, \$1,100.
 St. Joachim (Cote Neuve)—breakwater, \$3,000.
 St. Paul (Ile aux Noix)—improvements, \$4,500.
 St. Pierre les Pecquets—dredging, \$13,000.
 Ste. Rose—protection wall, \$4,900.
 Saguenay River—dredging, \$170,000.
 Sault au Mouton—channel, \$24,100.
 Sorel—harbour improvements, \$180,000.
 Tadoussac (Anse Tadoussac)—wharf improvements, \$12,500.
 Taillon (St. Henri)—wharf extension, \$1,300.
 Terrebonne—protection wall, \$16,200.
 Trois Rivieres—dredging, \$4,900.
 Val Barette—protection work, \$3,000.
 Varennes—protection wall, \$15,000.
 Vercheres—protection wall, \$10,000.
 Vercheres County—dredging—the provincial government contribution being a like amount, \$5,000.
 Yamaska—protection work, \$9,300.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MacNICOL: Hon. members cannot expect this vote to carry so rapidly. There is one item in it to which the house should give careful attention: I refer to that pertaining to the Richelieu river, \$500,000. Last session when this same amount was voted, if my memory is correct, the minister said that the matter of increasing the size of the Richelieu canal would be referred to the International Joint Commission. That commission held many meetings; I attended quite a number myself; some were held at New York, also at Albany, Plattsburg, Burlington, and Montreal. I believe I spent three days at the session at Montreal. A vast amount of information was submitted by eminent engineers and thoroughly competent men for and against further canalization from the St. Lawrence to the Hudson. I took my time and made a careful survey myself all along the Richelieu river, along lake Champlain and south to where the proposed canal would enter the Hudson river. I am convinced that the time has come when this whole project should be laid to one side until the International Joint Commission has reported on it.

There were three main proposals in reference to this work, and as far as I know not a

single one of them has been endorsed. Certainly the engineers from the United States—and there were quite a number of them at these meetings—and representatives of the railways and of business organizations all along the route were not at all in accord with the proposal for canalization via the Richelieu river.

From the United States side there were two proposals that might be considered; one was to commence a canal six miles east of Montreal, I presume from part of Montreal harbour, across to Chambly basin. That was not at all supported. The main United States proposal was to run a canal from lake St. Francis fifty-four miles overland to lake Champlain. I cannot see how any Canadian government could support such a proposal as that. They proposed to divert 5,000 cubic feet a second from lake St. Francis, which is 152 feet above sea level, run it across country, which is fairly level, and drop it into lake Champlain by either one or two locks, a drop of 52 feet. It is proposed to make the level of lake Champlain 100 feet.

I asked some engineers a number of questions about the volume of water and such matters, and it came out that this proposal was to take 5,000 cubic feet a second from lake St. Francis. What would they do with it after they got it to lake Champlain? They could not allow it to run down the Richelieu river; I believe the footage there is from 4,000 to 5,000 cubic second feet to 7,000 or 8,000. It is not to be expected that the Richelieu river bed would take in an additional 5,000 feet per second. And they do not propose to send it that way. Their proposal was to take it through the height of land, which I believe is about 47 feet, south of lake Champlain; in other words, send the St. Lawrence water south into the Hudson, at Northumberland, through one or two locks. That is out of the question; this government could not support that. And all the other proposals that Canada might entertain are out of the question, because the Americans are all against them.

Mr. BENNETT: They would have to widen and deepen the Richelieu river to carry this additional water.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was shown at these meetings that there are many private rights on the Richelieu that the government would have to buy, such as dam sites or present dams which are there. The engineers submitted figures showing that the cost would be staggering. In 1900 they figured the cost at \$60,000,000, but they now figure it at \$200,000,000 if they run the canal from lake St. Francis.

Mr. DUPUIS: Oh, yes.