

build a bridge from Verdun across Nuns' island to the south shore. From the information I have been able to obtain the bridges as they now are and after they have been repaired, will have a traffic capacity of 7,500 motor cars per hour in each direction. This means 15,000 cars per hour and I am told what is required today is several times that amount. For that reason I believe another bridge, which was in fact recommended in the report of 1950 with which I dealt earlier, should be built downstream from the present Jacques Cartier bridge.

The seventh suggestion is that representations should be made to the province of Quebec to construct another bridge alongside the Mercier bridge. The Mercier bridge which links the island of Montreal with the south shore of Caughnawaga is the property of the province of Quebec and the seaway authority has already spent many millions of dollars in building new approaches to that bridge. As a matter of fact it was indicated to the seaway authority at the time they negotiated contracts with the provincial authorities and afterwards for the approaches that it was the intention of the Quebec government to build another bridge at some future time and that therefore we should make, not two approaches but several in case a decision of that nature should be made by the province. This we have done. Well, giving effect to these intentions and thinking of the announcement made by the provincial government that a new, fast, modern and up to date highway would be built from Montreal to the Laurentians, we did provide the funds for these new and up-to-date approaches to the Mercier bridge and the approaches, when completed, will be ready for another bridge should the province decide to take such a step. Representations should be made accordingly by the present government.

That is why I think the minister and others representing the government should approach the provincial authorities with a view to getting an additional bridge built alongside the Mercier bridge so that it will form a trunk in the highway going to the Laurentians. While I am on this question of bridges may I add that the national harbours board will, I am sure, want to give consideration to the addition of another lane to the Jacques Cartier bridge. There is room there for one such lane, and its construction should not be much longer delayed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must inform him his time has expired.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I have one more suggestion if I could add it—

**Some hon. Members:** Proceed.

**Mr. Chevrier:** The final suggestion is that immediate consideration should be given to the construction of additional tunnels or overhead bridges on the Lachine canal. I have just one word and I will resume my seat sir. The Lachine canal, very much like the Welland canal, is in a bad way from the point of view of traffic. One has only to go there during the peak hours such as noon or five o'clock to realize what a bottleneck there is over the Lachine canal which is clustered with industry on both sides.

The former government built two tunnels, one at St. Remi and the other at Atwater, in co-operation with the city of Montreal which made pretty substantial contributions to them. It seems to me that tunnels or overhead bridges over the Lachine canal to remove the traffic bottlenecks should be given serious consideration. These are the suggestions which I wanted to make. They are made, as the house can see, in an attempt to be helpful. They are made in a constructive way and I hope the minister and his officials will find it possible to give effect to them.

**Mr. Charles Yuill (Jasper-Edson):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion thus far and I would like to place myself in the position of being in support of this resolution. I think the resolution is an excellent one because it deals with many phases of our social and economic development. Most of the problems that are embraced in the resolution are national in scope but although some appear to be national problems they seem to take on a local complexion because of their nature and there are some that could best be served by the joint action of the federal and provincial governments.

I have in my hand a copy of an article taken from *Maclean's* magazine of December 7, 1957, at page 1 entitled, "1967 Birthday Party—A Preview of Our Plans". The article reads:

It is only ten years until we celebrate our 100th birthday. What kind of party will we have? Here are some guesses by F. A. Hamilton, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources who is planning at long range Confederation Year—1967.

It will last a whole year, not just the weekend we now devote to Dominion Day. "The emphasis on Dominion Day in the past has been too much on baseball and not enough on national background," says Hamilton. "We want mass participation in the centennial. We want a rededication of the Canadian people—a resurgence of the national conscience."