

*St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act*

effect of delaying the opening of the seaway. All I can tell the committee is that the Hon. Lionel Chevrier, who is president of the St. Lawrence authority, has assured me that the question has been given most careful consideration by their technical advisers and they do not subscribe to the view which Mr. Moses has expressed that a high level highway bridge over the south channel will delay the opening of the seaway. I believe that opinion is likewise shared by the officials of the United States Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Apparently the officials of Ontario hydro have not expressed views similar to those of Mr. Moses, nor have the other two authorities concerned with the building of the seaway, but in view of the fact Mr. Moses holds a very important position can the minister give us any idea as to the type of objection Mr. Moses made and why this delay would occur? Were any suggestions ever forwarded to Mr. Chevrier?

**Mr. Marler:** I do not believe Mr. Chevrier has received any communications from Mr. Moses. I would merely suggest to the hon. member for Oxford that if he were interested in the development of the park and parkways in the state of New York, he would be delighted if this bridge were going to be built over Pollys Gut thereby bringing into the United States parkways system, and to the development that will probably take place in and around the United States portion of the seaway, all of the traffic that would be crossing from Cornwall. I think if I were in the position of Mr. Moses I would probably be most anxious to have the bridge built over Pollys Gut. But as I have no responsibility for parks or parkways in New York, I should like to see it where it would do the most good for the Indians on the St. Regis reserve.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** After having heard the comments of the minister and having taken a good look at a map of the area, I think I see what he means.

There is one other question I should like to ask. In the memorandum to which the minister referred, it was stated that this proposed new high level bridge over the south channel would cost \$8 million whereas the other one over Pollys Gut would cost \$9 million. In other words, the second one would cost about a million dollars less even though one would normally think a high level bridge would cost more. However, this proposed high level bridge only involves highway traffic, whereas the first bridge involves railway traffic as well as highway traffic.

**Mr. Marler:** Yes, that is quite right.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Are there any additional amounts for which the authority would be responsible besides the \$8 million to be expended on the bridge?

**Mr. Marler:** The \$8 million and the \$9 million to which I referred were the over-all costs. I believe our own technical people consider the \$8 million figure, if anything, a trifle high. There are greater savings, however, than the \$8 million or \$9 million figures would seem to indicate. If the hon. gentleman is speaking particularly about the original plan, I think the amount of highway relocation that is involved in bringing the traffic from the bridge over the north channel to the new bridge over the south channel is less and, inasmuch as there is no railway relocation, there are some substantial advantages.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** The only comment I had on that, Mr. Chairman, was apart from the \$8 million as set forth by the minister, there will be no additional amount to Canada.

**Mr. Marler:** I do not know whether an exact distribution has been worked out between the two parties of this sum of \$8 million to which I referred, but that is not to be paid solely by the St. Lawrence seaway authority. The costs are to be divided between the two authorities. I know of no other costs in connection with this particular aspect of the seaway construction program than are covered by the \$8 million.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I have one more question. Since the New York Central railway line between Ottawa and Cornwall is apparently to be abandoned—I understand this railway in the past has normally carried wood products from Ottawa and coal—what will the effect be on the upper end of the Ottawa valley of an arrangement of this sort?

**Mr. Marler:** The first point I should like to emphasize is that the abandonment of that section of line can only be undertaken after an application has been made to the board of transport commissioners and approved by the board. The second point I should like to make is that there has been no passenger service provided over that portion of the line for a very long time. There is, I understand, a very small volume of freight carried over it. My understanding of the matter is that it has been an uneconomic line so far as the New York Central is concerned.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** In other words, there will be a substitute service.