St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act

of the day the press were advised of it, and at a luncheon that was given in honour of His Excellency in the city of Cornwall that day a discussion of the matter followed. As I understood from His Excellency that he had already spoken to the then prime minister-

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Although I cannot lay my hand on the rule at the moment, I am quite sure I can do so in a short time. However, I am clear in my recollection that it is not in order to introduce the name of His Excellency into debate. It seems to me that my hon. friend is attempting to do that. He is not merely referring to His Excellency, which would be one matter, but he is referring to His Excellency with respect to a matter of government business. This is a reference which is clearly out of order.

Mr. Chevrier: So that there may be no difficulty about what my intention is, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could now refer to what the former prime minister did and then I would be in order, if there is any doubt about what I am about to say. It followed thereafter that the former prime minister, I believe, announced in the house that an invitation had been forwarded to Buckingham palace and had later been accepted. I do not know why the Minister of Justice interrupted me when I was making this interjection.

Mr. Fulton: Because the hon. member was out of order.

Mr. Chevrier: I would like now to refer to the statement the Prime Minister made when he announced the visit of the President of the United States to the opening ceremonies in Montreal. I took the occasion at that time to commend the government, and I want to repeat what I said then. I also want to add this. I think it was a gracious gesture on the part of the President of the United States to consent to come to the city of Montreal where, in his presence and that of Her Majesty, the facilities will be opened to navigation.

I also want to say, if I am not interrupted, what I said on a former occasion, namely that we in the seaway authority some two or three years ago had given consideration to this very matter. We had not, of course, discussed the details because we could not have arrived at a decision on them at the time. However, we had hoped that it would be possible to have two official openings, one in the purely Canadian section at Montreal and one in the international section.

I can see now why that would be difficult. [Mr. Chevrier.]

idea was an excellent one. During the course President who, after having presided with Her Majesty at the opening of the facilities at Montreal, would be obliged to travel for almost one day on the royal yacht in order to reach the international section. However, I am pleased to note that it will be possible for Her Majesty the Queen to visit the facilities on the Canadian side in the international section, and perhaps also on the United States side going over to Cornwall, Ingleside, Long Sault, Morrisburg and Iroquois. I have no doubt that the hon, member for Stormont was successful in making representations to the government as, I am sure, was the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas. I am sure the representations of the hon. member for Stormont, to which was added the charm of the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, had no little to do with this visit in that area.

> Before getting back to the resolution, Mr. Chairman, there is one comment I should like to make about the statement the minister gave to the house yesterday, as found at page 1162 of Hansard. Anyone looking at this statement will find that under the title "Date Decision Taken" there are a number of items which are referred to as the dates upon which certain decisions were taken with reference to an increase in expenditure. Most of those dates are in 1955 and 1956, at least prior to the present government being in office. There is one matter, however, with respect to which the minister did not refer to as a decision having been taken during that time, and it was the decision with respect to the royal visit.

> There are other matters to which my hon. friend referred and to which I should like to draw his attention as courteously as I can. While the decisions mentioned here were taken earlier and by another administration, none the less the projects that have been put into effect and the opening of the subsequent projects are events that have taken place during the present administration. I do not remember that at any of these official openings-and I have three of them in mind at the moment—the minister made any reference to decisions having been taken by the former government while he was opening these new facilities. However, I bring that matter to his attention so that perhaps in the future, when he is opening other facilities in the international section or elsewhere, he will be reminded that decisions were taken prior to the time the present government came into office.

I now come to the resolution which is before us and which seeks to amend section 13 of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act I can see now that it is difficult for the in order to increase from \$300 million to