

reach the Premier of Great Britain and make it clear to him that Britain should take a keener interest in Canada to-day than in any other of her overseas dominions; leading to greater activity in colonizing this country and greater British effort in our development.

I made the statement above that the report of the International Joint Commission may not have been very clear. May I explain what I meant. In our earlier years it was our custom to have two members, one from each country, sit down and write the report on any matter we were dealing with. I remember some years ago spending ten days in Toronto with an American colleague endeavouring to prepare a report. His fear was that I was trying to embody principles that might be favourable to Canada later on, and I had pretty much the same view in regard to his efforts. Later on we discovered that we had in the Canadian Secretary, Mr Burpee, a trained writer, and we adopted the policy of deciding principles and calling upon Mr Burpee to prepare a report. Even in that case there are difficulties because while a report prepared by one man is fairly clear from one end to the other, when we have six men around a table, one may drive a dent into the report on one side, another a dent into it on another side, and the principles that the writer was bringing out, may become more or less clouded.

I know for instance that one of your Montreal papers claimed that the Report called for international control. What we had in view was this: that if for instance, the United States has to pay a toll for the use of its commerce in our canals between Cornwall and Montreal, the charge might be made at any time that American vessels were not being treated on the same basis as Canadian vessels, and therefore the charge should be referred to an international body. That is the kind of control that was in the minds of our Commission.

Now please understand I am not out as an advocate on behalf of the development of the St Lawrence river. Speaking to you privately, I consider the Government is wasting our money at this time because we gave them an estimate of the cost prepared by the engineers of the two governments. Any work that is done by engineers now will still be an estimate. Probably the best way would be to take a dozen large public works, take the estimated cost, then the actual cost, find the difference between the two. The same percentage could be added to our estimate of the cost of the St Lawrence improvement.

We suggested to the two countries in our report, the apportionment of cost as stated to you above; in other words, we have given the two governments enough information to meet each other and see if they can determine upon an arrangement for carrying out the work. My mind is working always on the trade idea I have developed above and it seems to me that Canada should take the position of saying

*We also suggested a further engineering investigation before proceeding with the project.*