

St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act

almost 21 years now and I have never betrayed anyone let alone the city of Cornwall or the county of Stormont. My friend the hon. member for Stormont has never understood the project—the 238-242 single stage control scheme—that is taking place in his constituency or else he would never have made the speech he did.

Mr. Graftey: But he never headed the St. Lawrence seaway authority.

Mr. Chevrier: If the hon. gentleman had understood the project then at least he would have said that here we have at our very door right in the city of Cornwall a power project which has cost no less than \$300 million and perhaps more. There were other sums of money spent in that area arising out of the project such as, for the relocation of highway and railway routes, for the re-establishment of communities all along the water front, for the establishment of the new St. Lawrence seaway authority building and for the construction of the future 27-foot facilities. I say to the hon. gentleman who suddenly has complained about what has happened to the city of Cornwall that he has been delinquent in his duty to parliament in not rising in this chamber during the last session to cry out against the situation because, after all, we now know that it did not happen over night but has been in existence for several years. Why, then, did the hon. member not rise and tell the committee what had happened?

I will tell the hon. gentleman from Stormont what is required in the city of Cornwall for industrial development, and you must have it to progress, sir, and that is power. Instead of the hon. member for Stormont going about the constituency and elsewhere condemning the Ontario hydro power commission for the manner in which it did things, he should be commending the Ontario hydro power commission for the manner in which it has developed power facilities in Cornwall. If he did that it would be far better for him because then he might be able to get some power for the city of Cornwall.

Here is what has happened. Right across the way from the city of Cornwall on the United States side two large industries have been established, one a motor car industry and the other an aluminum industry and both of these will employ somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5,000 people. Why is it that two of those industries have gone across the line? The reason is that the New York state power authority have seen to it that power was assigned to that area. I say that the city of Cornwall has everything with which to develop and if my hon. friend, rather than condemning the hydro electric

power commission, were to direct his attention to the problems that are imminent in the city of Cornwall he would perhaps advance the cause of Stormont far better than he does at the present time.

The hon. member for Kingston raised the question of why navigational facilities were not provided for the port of Kingston. The hon. member is a new member and I will not take him to task but I will refer him simply to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act which sets out in detail the power of the authority. It is not to provide port facilities for any city but it is to dredge a channel 27 feet in depth. In the area of the Thousand islands section most of the channel is on the United States side. Therefore, the vast majority of the work assigned in the international section was given to the St. Lawrence seaway development corporation to perform in waters which the channel follows and which have from time immemorial, I am informed, been on the United States side of the line.

The hon. member for Danforth had something to say about increased costs. Then, he said that that is the reason why there are going to be such high tolls. Let me tell him at once that that is not the reason. The reason why there are going to be tolls is that an agreement was made between Canada and the United States long before I introduced legislation in the house. Prior to 1951 the then secretary of state for external affairs rose in his place and made a statement, followed by correspondence—I have forgotten whether it was an exchange of notes or not—in which the United States and Canada both stated that the facilities for the navigational aspect of the seaway would be amortized by the imposition of tolls, would be self-liquidating and would be paid by shippers and shipping companies using the seaway. That was the understanding long before the legislation was introduced and it is in the legislation. Surely the hon. member for Danforth should have read the legislation before he made that statement.

Mr. McDonald (Hamilton South): Will the hon. member permit a question. Would that agreement also include the Welland canal?

Mr. Chevrier: The agreement to which I have reference included no section. It dealt with the St. Lawrence seaway and since the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act describes the seaway as beginning at Montreal and ending at lake Erie, then I take it it includes the Welland canal.

I wanted to say something about contractor's claims, but the committee has been more than generous. It is almost a quarter