

of Mines and Technical Surveys, then that board would report to the minister of that department and the minister would in turn report to the government, and a decision would have to be made at the government level.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: Thank you very kindly. Under vote 80 I note that there are only three projects of conservation and control of water in the province of Ontario. I note there is an expenditure of \$712,500, contribution to the province of Ontario towards the cost of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority program. What percentage of the cost does that represent?

Mr. PATTERSON: My recollection of the overall cost of the Upper Thames is that it is in the neighbourhood of \$15 million.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: Yes. I notice in 1955-56 there was a contribution of \$700,000. All I am interested in, Mr. Patterson, is the percentage break between federal and provincial on that type of thing.

Mr. PATTERSON: Well, under the act the federal government can contribute up to 37½ per cent, but not more than the province. The municipality or the authority can contribute the other 25 per cent, or the province may take over any portion of that extra 25 per cent. But the federal contribution is limited to a maximum of 37½ per cent.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: Thank you. With a province the size of Ontario it seems to me, just at a glance, that there are not many agreements in operation with a province of that size. Have there been any new agreements signed recently?

Mr. PATTERSON: There are some being looked at.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: When was the last one signed?

Mr. PATTERSON: Metropolitan Toronto, I guess, was the last one signed, and that was several years ago. I would like to make a correction on that \$15 million I gave you for the Upper Thames. The total figure is \$9,640,000 for the Upper Thames.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: The figure you gave me which I was interested in was the 37½ per cent figure. It would seem to me that in this day and age, with all the talk about conservation, flood control and all the rest of it, that there is not very much going on in my native province.

I have one more question, Mr. Chairman, and then I will pass. There seems to be a grey area where nobody seems to accept responsibility—and this has nothing to do with pollution, Mr. Chairman; this has to do with water as a resource between the federal and provincial jurisdiction—on tributary streams which are considered navigable for part of their distance; nobody seems to know whose responsibility what is. Is there any arrangement between the two jurisdictions for this type of thing?

Mr. PATTERSON: Well, there is the Navigable Waters Protection Act under which any structure built in any stream which is declared navigable requires the approval of the Department of Public Works. The problem is to determine what is a navigable stream. There are many definitions of what is navigable. One definition is that anything which will float a log is navigable.

Mr. McCUTCHEON: Well, with that and so many different jurisdictions looking after water, in your opinion would it be beneficial towards a really