

It could not go *over* the embankment, because the summit will be above flood level, and therefore the only other passage way is by the South channel.

Now what would be state of this channel in such a case? It would have to carry its own flood water as well as that of the current of St. Mary. In fact the South channel would have to carry all the water of the river with the ice, both surface and *frasil*.

The effect of forcing the full discharge of the St. Lawrence into a channel which in winter is usually choked with *frasil* to the bottom, would be an experiment fraught with very great danger to the adjoining neighbourhood.

It is true that "water finds its own level," and without going into intricate calculations to prove what the level of the back water would be raised to by the proposed scheme, I am satisfied from experience that to direct the whole of the waters of the St. Lawrence in winter into the South channel, would increase the height of the water at the Victoria Bridge and Laprairie Basin, and that floods such as frequently occur would be greatly increased in the neighbourhood of St. Lambert, Laprairie, and Point St. Charles, to the serious injury of the property of the Railway Company and other proprietors.

Mr. Bateman says that the water will be raised 4 ft. 6 in. at the Victoria Bridge, but that this will not affect the low lands around Laprairie. But as the winter level of Laprairie Basin is now level with, and floods the lowlands when the water at the Victoria Bridge is only two feet below the level of Laprairie Basin, it becomes self-evident that the contemplated rise of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  ft. at the Victoria Bridge will back up the water at Laprairie to a greater extent. To fix, however, the exact limit of the backing of water by ice-jams and gorges is impossible.

At Laprairie, the low-lands traversed by the Railway have been inundated to an alarming extent, causing serious