

*St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act*

suppose a like amount is going to be paid by other entities. For instance, I find this item:

Additional cost to provide a high level Mercier bridge rather than a lift span to provide facilities necessary to take care of future expansion of Mercier bridge by the province of Quebec, \$11,000,000.

Apparently, this is a projection into the future. They are making changes to take care of future expansion which will save future exorbitant costs. I agree with that. This is important so far as the city of Montreal is concerned and I suppose under those circumstances they are going to pay their share. I do not think there will be too much to complain about there because projects of that nature are undertaken for the benefit of the people of Canada. No doubt it will entail increased costs but we are getting something for our money. Then, we come to this item:

Two railway single track lift bridges (C.P.R. crossing) rather than one double track, \$1,000,000.

I suppose they are going to pay their share out of the railway crossing fund which is appropriated from year to year. Another item reads:

Four-lane highway tunnel at Beauharnois in place of lift bridge (by request of province of Quebec), \$2,500,000.

This is a good investment and I assume the province of Quebec will be paying its share of the cost here.

We now come down to the international rapids section. I would like to elaborate on this. It has not been touched on in the committee but it is in that district. Last year we were given the opportunity of making a trip to that section of the St. Lawrence seaway. We were glad to visit that section. The former minister of transport, now the hon. member for Laurier, mentioned the fact that when the Minister of Transport opened up some new sections of the seaway he forgot to give the hon. member for Laurier the credit he was due; he did not tell him what a wonderful job he had done when he was minister of transport.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I said no such thing.

**Mr. Small:** The hon. member implied that.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I said no such thing in the course of my remarks, as the hon. member for Danforth would have known had he been listening to me.

**Mr. Small:** I was.

**Mr. Chevrier:** If he had been listening to me he would not have made the statement he did. On the contrary, I said that if the minister were opening future facilities—as he did in his remarks yesterday—should

make some reference to the previous administration. I did not refer to myself at all. The “previous administration” means the previous government.

**Mr. Small:** I will accept that explanation, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Thank you.

**Mr. Small:** I could tell a story about an individual whose name I must not mention. I could tell what he did and what he had to say about the canal and just exactly what he meant. The hon. member for Laurier has not been very reluctant to take credit for what he did, and I am not disputing his right to do so. I think he has been given a good deal of credit for the work he did as minister of transport and also as chairman of the seaway authority; but at the same time if people are taking credit for the good things they did, then they must also take the blame for the mistakes that have been made by their agency. If they are going to take the credit, then they must take the blame also for miscalculations. On the whole, it has been a good job. Some of the engineering feats have been outstanding. There have been some gross faults and there have been serious miscalculations. Since the hon. member was the head of the organization he is responsible for every man under him and it was his duty to see that the job was done well.

We had some outstanding men on that project. One of the men who was very prominent in so far as the operation of the seaway and power development was concerned was Mr. R. A. C. Henry. They had his advice and experience at their disposal. We were to look to him for the solution of the difficulties that were encountered but we now find ourselves in a position where there have been miscalculations, mismanagement, and a lack of proper engineering.

I should like to come back to what I started to say about the trip that we took last year. We visited all of the installations and saw what had been accomplished and it certainly was to the credit of the engineers. When we got down to Beauharnois project we found that it was in the building process and the gentleman who was giving us information as we went along said that this was the part that was holding them up. He said it would not be finished until next year because of certain conditions. He said it was the intention to open up the seaway this year but whether that was the permanent target date or the hoped-for target date in the estimates it would not be properly finished until this year because the target date was set at too short a time. Nonetheless, what happened