control program against this destructive parasite. Thousands of dollars were spent in developing methods to destroy the adult lamprey and its larvae. The controls were directed at the area of greatest concentration. This happened to be in the spring when they go up to the sandy, gravelly creeks to spawn.

Two methods of control were used. There was the electric barrier method which was aimed at the eel itself. Then there was the use of a chemical from the same chain, I believe, that aspirin comes from which was very effective in killing the young larvae. This is not harmful to any other fish, plant life or animals that might drink it. This method has been 90 per cent effective in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, and the trout are returning. There is a problem in Lake Michigan, however, because the fish are becoming overloaded beyond safe limits with insecticides. Lake Superior is too cold and unproductive. This leaves Lake Huron as the home of productive fishing.

The money set aside by the United States and Canada for the attack on the lamprey amounts to $1.5 million. This is a pretty small amount when one considers that the annual take in trout before the lamprey invasion was over 15 million pounds. If my mathematics are correct, this figures out to 10 cents a pound for control. Surely, this program should be stepped up in order to complete the eradication of the lamprey in Lake Huron.

I bring this point to the attention of the minister, who has a lot of common sense, for two reasons. First, Lake Huron should be restored to its rightful place as the greatest fishing lake in the chain of great lakes. Secondly, trout fishing is the backbone of commercial fishing. Then, of course, we have the hybrids that have been developed and introduced to some extent at some expense. They are faring well in Lake Huron and they are increasingly attracting anglers and tourists from all over the world. If there ever was, in my opinion, a pennywise and pound foolish move it was the principle of cutting back when success is well within your grasp.

The second reason is that the Trent canal has never had a lock at Big Chute. This bottleneck still remains at Big Chute where a quaint marine railway is unable to carry the larger and heavier boats using this waterway. This forms an effective barrier to large boats. The importance of the inland waterway has been recognized by the appointment of a provincial government representative and a federal government representative to a committee to study how the inland waterways can be improved and made more effective in serving the tourist population both local and otherwise.

The government completed the lock at Swift at an expense of well over $2 million. It is a very fine lock, in fact one of the finest you might see anywhere. Restoration plans for the Trent canal to the tune of $20 million were started by the Tory government. These plans were assessed when the Liberal government went into power and it carried on with them. As a result this lock was built at Swift. It is interesting to note that in 1955 over 27,000 boats used this waterway, but in 1964, just nine years later, over 112,000 boats used it and the number is increasing. How can the government justify spending that $2 million on the lock at Swift and still leave the old bottleneck to this ever increasing traffic at the Big Chute? The fear is that sea lamprey may gain entrance to the inland waterway after the construction of the other lock. I suggest to the minister that it is up to us to eradicate the sea lamprey and then complete the Trent canal water system.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) for his submission. We certainly have to take a look at these situations from time to time, but he has left the impression that the sea lamprey control program has been cut back.

It has been cut back in dollar terms this year by approximately one per cent. In 1966-67 Canada spent $425,000 on this program. In 1967-68 we spent $452,000, and last year we spent $498,000. This year's budget is for $493,000 which is down $5,000, or approximately one per cent. The main reason it is down is that the United States fish and wildlife administration is unable to budget for additional funds.

The arrangement between the Canadian and the United States administration, under the Great Lakes fishery commission, calls for a 69 per cent United States contribution and a 39 per cent Canadian contribution. Our contribution is determined automatically by the United States contribution.

As the hon. member says, the use of lampricide, which began in 1958, was remarkably successful in reducing the sea lamprey population in the upper lakes by 80 per cent by 1962, and 90 per cent by 1964. The program