

of the statement made by the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett when the present Deputy Minister of Finance was appointed.

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Any statement given to the press is merely a matter of publicity and is not an official document. The only official document concerning the appointment of a deputy minister is the order in council appointing him.

LAKE OF THE WOODS CONVENTION

PAYMENT UNDER ARTICLES VIII AND IX OF TREATY OF 1925, AS PROVIDED IN ITEM 606 OF THE ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Is the acting Prime Minister (Mr. Lapointe) ready to give answers to the two questions I asked a day or two ago respecting the Lake of the Woods convention and the Long Lake water diversion?

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): With regard to the Lake of the Woods convention, 1925, the hon. member asked whether the vote for \$214,025.57 was the final payment. It is the final payment, being an agreed amount based upon the final accounting after the completion of all the expenditures by the United States government. I have a long memorandum about the matter; I suppose it is not necessary to read it all, but this is the final payment and it was based upon an agreement made between the two governments a few years ago to settle the matter.

LONG LAKE WATER DIVERSION

PROPOSED OPENING OF SLUICE GATES TO CARRY PULPWOOD THROUGH INTERNATIONAL HEIGHT OF LAND

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) referred also to the diversion at Long Lake and raised a question with respect to the sluice gates in the canal south of the lake. He stated that whoever is in charge of the canal is going to open the gates inside the international height of land. He stated that the Minister of Justice knows that as soon as these gates are opened it will constitute a violation of the boundary waters treaty, and he wanted to know whether the government is going to permit these gates to be opened.

There was originally a project for diverting a substantial amount of water for the purpose of hydro-electric power development through this canal, and ultimately into lake Superior. This project might have given rise to a situation in which the United States authorities could have contended that a breach of article III of the boundary waters treaty was involved. Whether or not a breach of this article would be involved is an arguable question, upon which the government is not prepared to express any opinion at the present stage. The matter would have to be decided ultimately by the international joint commission.

It is understood that the Ontario authorities are not proceeding with this project, but that they may be utilizing the canal in question for the purpose of carrying logs into waters draining into lake Superior.

If this is done, an appreciably different situation would arise. The Canadian government is not prepared to accept the position that a diversion of this kind, of such a magnitude that it could have no appreciable effect upon levels on the other side of the international boundary line, would involve a breach of the treaty.

In so far as the international aspect of the problem is concerned the government has therefore no present intention of taking any action in this matter.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

VALIDITY OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET RESOLUTIONS IN COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

On the the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Kootenay East): The other day I drew attention—I am addressing my remarks chiefly to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe)—to what I considered to be a weakness in the procedure of the house in introducing amendments subsequently incorporated in bills which by constitutional practice are based upon resolutions, and having particular reference to the bills based upon the resolutions which were part of this year's budget. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether the justice department has given any consideration to the validity in law of the amendments which were made to these bills during the committee stage and which constituted definite alterations in fact and in substance to the bills based upon the original resolutions; for example the case of matches, and there were one or two similar amendments.