

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Chairman, this vote covers a matter which is, I think, of immediate concern to those of us who reside in the Montreal area. The minister will probably remember that last year prior to the spring freshets the level of the water in the port of Montreal was very seriously affected and—

**Mr. Jones:** Only four Liberals here.

**Mr. Chevrier:**—the reason was that the plan for the control of the downstream interests and the downstream levels at Montreal was not working out to the satisfaction of the international St. Lawrence river board of control. What I have to say is of course not in the slightest degree critical of this board because I think they and their predecessors have done very good work in an effort to protect the downstream interests as well as the upstream interests. My reason for raising the matter is to ask one or two questions upon which I hope I can get some elucidation. First, about this plan which has been in operation for some time, namely, plan 1958-A which was to have been amended by the Canadian section in co-operation with the United States section of the international St. Lawrence river board of control in order to find a better method of protecting the navigation interests, upstream as well as downstream. My question is: has the amendment to this plan been made?

While the minister is waiting for his officials, perhaps I may raise the other matter I have in mind. As a result of the difficulties which were experienced in Montreal harbour in the closing weeks of navigation in the 1960 season under plan of regulation 1958-A, the international joint commission at its April 1961 meeting gave to the board of control some discretionary authority under that plan whereby some additional storage could be accumulated on lake Ontario during the high supply months for release out of the St. Lawrence river during the low waterfall months. I am informed that under this authority the board has accumulated during the past summer 0.3 foot of storage on lake Ontario. This depth on the lake is equivalent to 104,000 cubic feet per second for one week, or sufficient to raise the level of Montreal harbour one foot for somewhat more than five weeks. The question is: has there been a greater amount of water stored in lake Ontario, not only for the protection of the downstream interests at Montreal but also for the protection of the interests on lake St. Francis and in the Cornwall area?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I must apologize to the hon. member. The official who has this information has apparently got lost between the gallery and the floor. He has not arrived.

[Mr. Fisher.]

I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to convey the answers to these questions to him.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Yes, that would be agreeable. However, there are one or two other matters which arise. It has been found that there is not a sufficient amount of flow coming into the river following the plan which was established by the international board of control. The question arises as to whether or not there will be additional quantities of water diverted from lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence river so as to increase the flow in the low water period in order to protect navigation and, secondly, to protect power development as well.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I shall be glad to undertake that this information will be communicated to the hon. member.

**Mr. Herridge:** This item is in connection with professional and special services, water resources branch. I presume it has something to do with the salaries paid to the technical people upon whom this government has relied for advice in connection with the Columbia river treaty proposals.

I should like to bring to the minister's attention an item in today's *Citizen* which appears under the heading: "Columbia Pact—McNaughton Says Canada Sold Out". It reads in part:

General A. G. L. McNaughton, retiring chairman of the Canadian section of the international joint commission, said today that the Columbia river treaty amounts to "servitude in perpetuity of our vital rights and interests."

The report goes on to say:

The 75-year-old former wartime army leader and defence minister lashed out against the negotiators of the Columbia treaty on the grounds that they had departed from the principles based on engineering studies laid down by the I.J.C.

General McNaughton goes on to say:

The Canadian negotiators were a house divided against itself, unskilled and uninformed in its representatives. They opened a situation for the Americans to exploit and I can't blame the Americans for doing so.

The article continues:

At another point in an interview here prior to his return to Ottawa, General McNaughton reiterated the charge in these words: "The Americans saw we were a house divided against itself—they moved in on these people and skinned them alive."

These are very serious charges coming from a person who has had the longest acquaintance with proposals for the development of this river in various ways. There is another aspect of this question. Other people have come to me and told me they have visited the water resources branch seeking information with respect to certain aspects of this treaty but were unable to get it. I