

*Canadian Centennial*

the regions of Canada. Nonetheless, I think that survey should be made to ascertain what are the advantages to the central provinces; what are the advantages to the Atlantic provinces; what to the prairies, what to British Columbia, and, last but not least, what to that great area which lies to the north, the pre-cambrian shield, because already tremendous mineral and metal development is beginning to take advantage of the seaway route.

I believe the survey should study and include something of the effect upon the ports extending from Rimouski, Seven Islands, Quebec, Three Rivers, Sorel—I jump over Montreal for the time being—Cornwall, Brockville, Kingston and Windsor—I pass over Toronto and Hamilton for the time being—to Sarnia and the lakehead. It seems to me that while the measure which the minister introduced concerning the port of Hamilton was a good one, and I felt I should support it because of the knowledge I had of conditions there, he will be getting requests from ports all across Canada for similar assistance. He already has a request of this nature from the lakehead. He, I believe with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Comtois) and others, went to Three Rivers and received representations there. Until a survey has been made of all these ports as to what kind of traffic will be most likely to go to one port of the seaway rather than the other, it seems to me that without an over-all policy of planning as that recommended here, disorder will follow.

Finally, it strikes me that the survey should have particular reference to the Metropolitan area of Montreal within a radius around that city of 100 miles, and similarly around metropolitan Toronto as far as Hamilton. I deal now particularly with Montreal because I represent a constituency in that city. I believe that the area of the city of Montreal within a radius of 100 miles will be tremendously affected by this development. The reason I suggest an economic study is that we have no such survey at the moment, other than the one which was prepared by the economic research division of the Department of Trade and Commerce in 1951 which was good at that time. It is seven years old, and much of it is based upon information which is out of date. I used it in the introduction of the legislation in the House of Commons in 1951, and I think conditions have changed so much that a great deal of this information is obsolete.

Then, may I draw to the attention of the house that the St. Lawrence seaway development corporation, the U.S. entity building the seaway had a United States economist, Dr.

Hazard, prepare a survey in 1955 or 1956, I am not too sure—having to do with the effect of the seaway upon the economy of the United States. Then, I hold in my hand something which I believe is novel, but it is one of the finest studies I have ever read of the effects of the St. Lawrence seaway on grain movements. It was prepared by Joseph R. Hartley in conjunction with the Indiana University school of business and in co-operation with the Chicago board of trade. It is one of the finest surveys on the movement of grain in the St. Lawrence, and I commend it to the minister's attention. I wish I had time to take six or seven excerpts from it which I have marked out, but I will take only one because I think the house will perhaps not have realized just what, in the eyes of this United States group, the seaway means to them. Dealing with grain, one of the recommendations says:

The large volume of Canadian grain which already moves on the St. Lawrence canals will be extended somewhat by diversion from other routes. The relative changes will be much less than for United States grain. Total Canadian seaway exports will range 200 million bushels. The combined Canadian-American volume will be in the neighbourhood of 350 to 400 million bushels by the mid-1960's.

That is something we did not take into consideration when we were considering the project back in 1951. This survey says there will be no less than 200 million bushels of American grain going down the seaway. I quote from page two.

By 1966, the seaway will be carrying from 150 million bushels to 200 million bushels of United States grain exports, assuming present levels of international grain trading will be sustained.

That is why I say all these ports along the route are bound to be affected if this statement is accurate, and there is no reason why it should not be so. I may, perhaps, be asked this question: why did not you have a survey done when you were in government? Well, we started, and we asked a prominent transportation economist of considerable renown in this country to prepare an economic survey of the effects of the seaway on the various parts of Canada. He proceeded with this work, but unfortunately he was interrupted in his task because his services were required with the royal commission on economic prospects, and when that was over and he was prepared to continue his research we appointed him to the tolls committee to discuss the question of tolls with a similar committee in the United States. My understanding is that a large portion of this work has already been done, and that it would not take too much time to complete it. It would be of tremendous use, to the minister and to his department and to the country at large.

[Mr. Chevrier.]