

Division

Habel	Munro
Hahn	Nicholson
Haidasz	O'Keefe
Hays	Olson
Hellyer	Otto
Honey	Patterson
Jewett, Miss	Pennell
Kelly	Pickersgill
Konantz, Mrs.	Pilon
Lachance	Prud'homme
LaMarsh, Miss	Regan
Lamoureux	Richard
Laniel	Rideout, Mrs.
Leblanc	Rinfret
Leduc	Robichaud
Legault	Rochon
Lessard (Lake St. John)	Rock
Lessard (St. Henry)	Rouleau
Lloyd	Ryan
Loiselle	Sauvé
Macaluso	Sharp
Macdonald	Stewart
MacEachen	Tardif
Mackasey	Tellet
MacNaught	Temple
McIlraith	Thompson
McMillan	Tremblay
McNulty	Tucker
McWilliam	Wahn
Matte	Walker
Mitchell	Watson (Châteauguay- Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Moreau	Whelan—110.
Morison	
Mullally	

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fairweather: I was paired with the hon. Member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. Groos: I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the very honourable Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), who is attending a dinner at the British Embassy this evening and discussing matters not only of the greatest national—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Harkness: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; there is no British Embassy in this country. I think the hon. Member for York-Humber should apologize for having made that statement.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. Member will have ample opportunity very shortly. The question is on the main motion.

• (8:50 p.m.)

WATER LEVELS IN THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak tonight on a subject that I believe should be brought to the attention of the country I should like to remind the Members of the House that it is exactly one year ago today when the last discussion occurred on this question of water levels in the Great Lakes. While I spoke for some seven minutes on the question of the water levels of the Great Lakes at that time—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. Perhaps the hon. Member might wait just a moment until the situation has recovered itself in the Chamber. Order please.

Mr. Cowan: I wish to point out that while I spoke a year ago today on the question of water levels on the Great Lakes, I wish tonight to draw the attention of the House to a situation that applies to one lake only in the Great Lakes system, and that is Lake Ontario, where the water level has reached a point that it has become a problem for the Province of Ontario, the State of New York, and even for the two nations that border on the Great Lakes.

At the present time there is an investigation being held into water levels on the Great Lakes, as a direct result of the comments made a year ago following a private Member's bill. But I say to you that the question of controlling the water level of Lake Ontario is not intertwined with the problem of controlling the water levels of Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan and Lake Superior. If one spreads his attention to the water level problem of the Great Lakes, on all five lakes concerned, he is going to be wasting time regarding the problem of Lake Ontario, because Lake Ontario can be controlled at the present time if action were to be taken.

Lake Superior is under control at the present time, and has been since 1921 when the International Joint Commission took control of it and has maintained its level within a range of four feet for more than 40 years. In fact at the present time the water level of Lake Superior is confined to a range of only 18 inches. It varies in height above sea level from 602.1 feet to 603.6 feet, which is a mere range of 18 inches on the greatest of the Great Lakes.