

Mr. PETERS: I did not mean the whole section, just the reporting section. The proposition as we understood it was that it was very difficult to establish a pattern of why more water was not available in the great lakes basin in relation to rainfall and the amount of water going into the lakes. Has that information been put into a form in which predictions can be made by the water resources branch?

Mr. CAMERON: In the great lakes study, one of our committees does cover that feature and the "met" service has membership on that committee, so that the channels have been set for complete co-ordination.

Mr. PETERS: What were the results of the study that was taking place last year in terms of evaporation? Has there been any published papers as a result of that study?

Mr. CAMERON: I am not aware of any published paper. An evaporation study necessarily must extend over a period of years. The rate of evaporation varies with various meteorological conditions and studies to be useful must extend over a period of years.

Mr. PETERS: In general, what is the prediction for this year for the great lakes water level?

Mr. CAMERON: In March the outlook was very good and for some reason in April supplies cut off very sharply. May was somewhat better, but what the trend will be over the rest of the year, I do not know; we are still looking forward to an improved condition—

Mr. PETERS: Is it above or below the average?

Mr. CAMERON: Well, the lake levels are approximately, for the most part, average. The supply on some of the lakes has been above average; on some it has been about average.

Mr. PETERS: Is the report published yet of the study made in the restrictions made in the St. Clair River area?

Mr. CAMERON: No. There has been no report published.

Mr. PETERS: What is the progress of those studies? Have they developed a mock-up of the area for study, or are you going to put in the cement restrictions, or what is the situation?

Mr. CAMERON: The corps of engineers of the U.S. Army, which is the responsible body for placing these restrictions or underwater dikes in place, have studied on a model at Vicksburgh, Mississippi, a location of these underwater structures, but there has not been agreement between the U.S. and the Canadian officials on the amount of restriction that is required to counterbalance the excavation that was made for navigation purposes. The Canadian officials considered that the effect was greater than the U.S. officials have admitted or have agreed to. Pending the outcome of some agreement, the official exchange of notes between the two governments, why the construction of those structures has not been started.

Mr. PETERS: Is this being handled by the International Joint Commission?