

tional Waterways Commission. On the one hand you have the United States, and on the other hand the Dominion of Canada. You have as a common property the Niagara river. The report of the joint commission, if I remember the figures aright, recommends to both governments that there should be an arrangement or a treaty entered into by which there should be permitted to be developed on the Canadian side 36,000 cubic feet per second and on the American side 18,500 cubic feet per second.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. No.

Mr. HYMAN. Will the hon. gentleman kindly give me the figures?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The present development includes 32,100 feet on the Canadian side and 26,400 on the American side.

Mr. HYMAN. Why will the hon. gentleman persist in quoting from a report which is only preliminary? It is dated last December and it is not the joint report upon which they concurrently came to a conclusion. I desire to speak not of the preliminary report, but of the report upon which they came to a conclusion. The commission met together and they came to a certain conclusion. They came to the conclusion to report to their respective governments what? that upon the Canadian side there should be permitted to be withdrawn 36,000—I am speaking from memory—cubic feet per second, and on the American side 18,500 cubic feet per second.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. 28,500.

Mr. HYMAN. But there are 10,000 feet to be taken off that. The hon. gentleman is mixing up the question of the Chicago Drainage canal and the Niagara river.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The report mixes them up.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman understands it perfectly well. He understands perfectly well that the report as submitted to both governments, is that upon the Canadian side there may be developed 36,000 cubic feet per second, and on the American side 18,500 cubic feet per second—about 100 per cent more on the Canadian side than on the American side. It does seem to me that there must be some very strong reasons why the United States and Canada should enter into this agreement if it can be shown to be to the mutual interests of both countries. The hon. gentleman sees that it is not proposed to enter into any treaty, even if we were agreed as to the details, which will last for all time to come. It would be quite easy, it would be quite proper, even without any justification from the report, if we were to negotiate or enter into a treaty to cover 10, 15, or 25 or any

number of years. When the hon. member remembers that 36,000 cubic feet per second represents something in the neighbourhood of 430,000 horse-power at Niagara Falls, and when he remembers that the commission of which he was a member, after carefully going into the question and ascertaining all the details, found that the power which is at present in use or is likely to be required for four or five years to come is something under 100,000 horse-power—

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In the seven municipalities concerned, but there are many others.

Mr. HYMAN. That practically means an addition of a few hundred horse-power only.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about all the railways?

Mr. HYMAN. I am speaking of the present moment. The railways are not using electricity at the present moment. Thirty-six thousand cubic feet per second represents 430,000 horse-power. To-day all you would require would be 100,000 horse-power. I take it that that means that everybody who uses electricity as a force would require 100,000 horse-power. Therefore, you have a margin of 330,000 horse-power, or 330,000 per cent over and above the amount you are using at the present time. Now, the question has been raised whether the scenic beauties of Niagara Falls should be preserved or not. Looking at it simply and solely from the commercial standpoint it would seem that they should not if there is any reason to suppose that at the present time, or in the near future, or within the limit of time that this or any other government might enter into a treaty with the United States, more power will be required than is allowed to be developed by that limit of 36,000 cubic feet per second.

The hon. gentleman refers to some discrepancies in the figures. I can only say for the International Waterways Commission that their figures were arrived at only after the most careful computation, and only after the most careful research among all the known authorities upon the question as affecting the Niagara Falls water power. The Canadian section were given carte blanche as far as this government were concerned to employ engineers in their own country or engineers to be got any place in the world. They came to a conclusion, after they had sufficient data before them, and I have no doubt that the data which the hon. gentleman quotes from was also before them when they came to their conclusion in reference to the figures they have given.

Just one word in regard to the Chicago Drainage canal. I have not the report before me, but if the hon. gentleman will look at the report, he will find that the authori-