

Supply—Transport

if the seaway tonnage is to meet expectations, when it will be necessary to give serious consideration to twinning the Welland canal. At that time I would urge the minister that a thorough study be made of the possibility of using the Trent-Severn canal system as an alternative.

If a line is drawn from the head of lake Superior through Sault Ste. Marie and projected eastward it roughly parallels the old Trent-Severn canal route from Georgian bay to the bay of Quinte. This historic waterway is approximately 800 miles shorter than the more roundabout southerly route. Not only would it be shorter, but this alternative route would be all-Canadian and its use would revitalize the fine old logging communities in this area. Part of this area, like the historic old eastern district of Ontario, has not enjoyed the prosperity that is so evident in the rest of Ontario. The economy has gone sour and every effort should be made to sweeten it for both of them.

Instead of spending the astronomical sums required on a second Welland canal the adoption of this route would hasten the day when our dreams of an all-Canadian seaway would be realized and would do a great deal both for this particular area and for the area immediately to the east of it, namely my own area of Stormont.

Mr. Chevrier: I had no intention of speaking on this item again, Mr. Chairman, because I took part in the debate earlier. Were it not for the remarks made by the hon. member for Stormont—the distinguished hon. member for Stormont, I shall call him—I would not have entered this debate. The hon. member has said that one of the greatest engineering blunders of all time was the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, may I say that is not what I said? I said it was a great engineering feat which included a monumental blunder.

Mr. Chevrier: If my hon. friend wants to correct himself and say that it is a monumental blunder, that is all right; I will accept a correction. I am sure, however, that the Minister of Transport does not agree with him. I have read most of the speeches on the seaway made by the Minister of Transport and those associated with this great project and they certainly do not support or confirm the view of the hon. member for Stormont.

However, my hon. friend is perhaps annoyed at the fact that the other day I rose to bring before the House of Commons a matter which affected the constituency of Stormont which I represented in this House of Commons, for years, namely the present stagnation and

[Mr. Campbell (Stormont).]

pollution of the waters of the Cornwall canal, a matter to which the minister very amiably agreed to give careful consideration. The hon. member for Stormont probably takes umbrage at that fact. When I feel that the constituency of Stormont or any other constituency requires the services of myself or of some hon. member of the House of Commons on this side, I intend to rise in my place in this chamber and make myself heard, no matter what any other hon. member thinks. I think that is clearly the duty of any hon. member of the opposition.

Prior to the luncheon recess the hon. member for Stormont indicated in effect that I had sold the constituency down the river. His colleague who sat next to him, namely the hon. member for St. Jacques, in a speech which he delivered in this house last year, said that the city of Montreal, because of my presidency of the St. Lawrence authority, received nothing and that everything went to the city of Cornwall. He referred particularly to two bridges that were being built by the St. Lawrence seaway authority as well as a great deal of other navigational work that was being done in that area. Both of those statements cannot be true. The truth probably lies midway between the two.

However, the hon. member for Stormont rose in order to deal with a point about which he forgot to speak. I intend to deal with that matter at this time, namely the fact that there has been a considerable reduction in the flow of the river through the present Cornwall canal. The velocity of the water going through the Cornwall canal has been reduced to about one thirtieth, according to an article which appeared in the *Cornwall Standard-Freeholder* of June 7 of this year. I wish to quote just one short paragraph from it. It states as follows:

Before construction of the power project, flow of water through the canal has been estimated at 2,950 cubic feet per second. Now only 290 cubic feet per second flow through the valve in the closure structure at the lake St. Lawrence dike.

There appeared in the local Cornwall paper a series of photographs. One shows the picture of the stagnation at Mack's bridge, a swimming hole which young children and youngsters enjoyed for many years. Another picture which appeared on May 31 shows the slimy substance which coats the top of the near stagnant water on the Cornwall canal.

I now show those two pictures to the minister. They may have been brought to his attention already. However, all this goes to indicate that there is not enough velocity of water in the Cornwall canal. A serious problem of pollution is arising. The stagnation of water is a matter of seriousness to