

*St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act*

responsibility for and the cost of construction of the enlargements in their respective countries; (3) it was essential that Canada protect at this time her future position and provide also at this time for construction of a 27-foot channel to the proposed entrance of the future canal in Canada between lake St. Francis and the pool above the power dam and the carrying on of such channel enlargements north and south of Cornwall island as to maintain the distribution of flow between the north and south channels as well as to reduce the velocity of flow at the entrance of the 27-foot canal in Canada; (4) each of the power entities would contribute \$6 million or a total of \$12 million to the cost of such enlargements, and an improvement of about one foot in the head was to be anticipated when the enlargements had been completed; (5) these channel enlargements north and south of Cornwall island were extensive in character and had the effect not only of reducing the cost of the power development that was originally anticipated when Canada made the agreement with Ontario in December of 1951, but also materially increased the cost of the seaway both to the United States and to Canada.

The result of these discussions was that the increased cost amounted to \$35,874,000 less the \$12 million paid by the power entities which, roughly speaking, left a balance of \$24 million; and both the St. Lawrence seaway authority and the St. Lawrence seaway development corporation, the United States entity, agreed to share this balance of \$24 million by each paying one half. The estimated cost of the seaway was therefore increased by \$12 million.

At this point, I pose the following question. How was it that this was not anticipated in either the 1932 or 1941 agreements? It was. This matter of downstream dredging is clearly contained in the estimates prepared by Mr. Lindsay, but it is contained there as a work common to power and navigation rather than as a work which would be the responsibility of navigation alone.

In so far as the 1951 discussions were concerned, it was not anticipated at the time that this work should be done in the south channel opposite Cornwall island, because the canal was entirely in Canadian territory. Now I should like to go a step farther, though I hesitate to trespass further on the time of the committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I am sure most hon. members of this committee have visited the site of the works and will remember the tremendous power house which is situated in the middle of the river, and which is partly in Canada

and partly in the United States. Downstream from the power house are two channels, one being the north channel which is in Canadian territory and the other being the south channel which is partly in Canada and partly in the United States. It is in the south channel that most of this work to which I have been referring in the amount of \$35 million was anticipated when this report was made.

The point I wish to make is this. The flow of the water in the north channel is 33½ per cent, entirely in Canadian territory, and the flow of the water is 66½ per cent in the south channel part of which is in Canada and part of which is in the United States. It became obvious during the course of the discussions that the dredging to the extent I have mentioned in the south channel would disturb the flow in boundary waters, and when that dredging was complete what would happen would be that instead of having a flow of 33½ on the one side and 66½ on the other, the dredging would make the flow of the water 80 per cent in the south channel as opposed to 20 per cent in the north channel.

We—and when I say we I mean by that the seaway authority, the engineers, the government and the committee established representing various departments of government—came to the conclusion that the only thing to do at the time was to maintain the flow of the water in both channels, because if that were not done then at a later date it would be necessary to make an application to the international joint commission to obtain permission to change the flow.

Over and above the necessity I have mentioned here, it became obvious that to maintain the flow certain other works had to be done in the north channel. It was suggested at that time that a huge hole be dredged in the north channel in order to restore the balance. All of us took the view at the time that Canada would determine the manner in which the flow of water in the north channel was to be maintained, and Canada determined that the flow of the water was to be maintained by dredging a 27-foot channel in the north channel which would lead to a future canal on the Canadian side, and that also added substantially to the cost.

During the summer of 1952 another event occurred. I leave for a moment the purely navigational aspect to state that while—

**Mr. Pallett:** It is taking quite a while.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Well, I am sorry it is taking quite a while and I am grateful to the committee for having allowed me to take quite a while, but I should like to explain at some length what actually took place.