

afterwards called the Newmarket canal. Up there in northern Ontario you will find docks and locks out in the middle of the fields, with water more or less miles away. Of course I realize that the Richelieu river is a much finer river; it is magnificent compared with anything we have up in that part of Ontario. But I cannot forget what happened two years ago, when the United States government and the Canadian government were considering, through the International Joint Commission, a recommendation to canalize the Richelieu river so that boats of large tonnage could go down that river from lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence, and south again into the Hudson river, so that there might be an ocean seaway from New York to Montreal via the Richelieu. Apparently that is all abandoned and some other scheme is now proposed. I note from the communication which the Canadian government made to the International Joint Commission in 1937 that the scheme has been changed from one of navigation to one of flood prevention, similar to the scheme proposed in 1907, which was also one of flood prevention.

Now, what was the application of the government of Canada to the International Joint Commission with respect to Richelieu river remedial works? On page 1, paragraph 2, we read:

The parliament of Canada, at its last session, appropriated the sum of \$500,000 under vote 408, S.S.E. 1936-37, as follows:

"Richelieu river—improvement of river and Chambly canal system, \$500,000."

This vote is for the purpose of the construction of remedial works for the reclamation and protection of low lands in St. Johns, Iberville and Missisquoi counties, in the province of Quebec.

The International Joint Commission granted the application of the government. It is referred to on page 7 of this same report that I am reading, in paragraph 11:

This matter is, accordingly, being submitted to the commission by the government of Canada, and it is hoped that the commission, in view of the need for protection against flood conditions, will expedite matters so that construction can be commenced at an early date.

I understand that later on the International Joint Commission gave that right. What I am trying to get through my head is, how are the figures of the water levels in this report to be reconciled with those of the water levels contained in the submission to the International Joint Commission some two years ago? The low water level of lake Champlain is 93.3, and the high, 102.6. But this report states that the work proposes to lower the water level of lake Champlain to 92.5. For it states on page 6:

It is the intention of the government of Canada that during the navigation season the water level above the dam will be maintained at or above the present ordinary minimum elevation of 92.5—

If it is to be maintained at that level, has the government obtained the consent of the United States to the lowering of the low water level of lake Champlain from 93.3 to 92.5? I have not found anything in the reports to indicate that the United States government has endorsed that low water level. Last fall, in company with an engineer and a newspaper man, I spent some time along the Richelieu river trying to find those low lands, and had great difficulty in doing so. As a matter of fact only a very small part of lake Champlain, about seventeen square miles, is in Canada. I went all around that area. The day I visited the north end of lake Champlain, at Missisquoi bay, the water level was between 95 and 96 feet above sea level, approximately three feet higher than the level proposed by the government; and on that day the water was five feet below the road level. I measured it. I asked some of the old-timers there what was the effect when the lake was at high water level, 102.6, and they told me that the road was sometimes covered to the extent of a foot or a little more, but that the water did not stay there very long.

I should like the minister to tell us, if he can, how many square miles or acres of so called low lands are flooded by lake Champlain, and if it will be of much value to relieve these low lands of the water for two or three weeks in the spring. The land did not appear to me to be very good. The trees did not seem to be damaged at all by the high water. On the west side of the river the banks are high; on the east side there may be a little more flooding of land, but it does not last very long. According to the information I obtained at the engineer's office, the dam is to be eighteen feet high. I may not have the correct figures, but if the dam that is proposed to be built at Fryer's island is to be eighteen feet high, each side of the river at that point will be flooded. I believe the banks on the east side are about fifteen feet above the river and those on the west side about twelve feet. I should like to find out from the minister if it is proposed to build dykes along where the dam is to be built in order to keep the land, which is good at that point, from being flooded.

I have no objection whatever to the work if it is necessary and there is any value to it. I do not want the people of that community to think I am opposing it for any reason other than what my own judgment tells me.