



Conditions d'utilisation et droit d'auteur

Les reproductions fournies par BAC sont réservées à des fins de recherche ou d'études privées. Il incombe aux utilisateurs qui souhaitent utiliser ces reproductions pour toutes autres fins d'obtenir la permission écrite du titulaire du droit d'auteur. Le récipiendaire sera tenu responsable de toute infraction au droit de propriété de cette copie numérique.

BAC possède une vaste quantité de documents pour lesquels la propriété et le statut du droit d'auteur peuvent être difficiles à établir, soit en raison d'information insuffisante, soit à cause de leur origine mixte, c'est-à-dire publique et privée, ou encore parce qu'il s'agit de documents en partie publiés et en partie inédits. On suggère aux utilisateurs de consulter la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur* et d'obtenir un avis juridique lorsque l'interprétation du droit d'auteur soulève des questions. BAC n'a pas le mandat d'interpréter la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur* pour le bénéfice des utilisateurs, et il incombe à ces derniers de connaître les obligations que comportent les droits d'auteur.

Pour en savoir davantage, consultez la page « Avis » du site Web de BAC : <http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/fra/Pages/avis.aspx>

Terms of use and Copyright

Any copy provided by LAC is restricted to research purposes or private study. Users wishing to use the copies for any other purpose should obtain written permission of the copyright owner. Responsibility regarding questions of copyright that may arise in the use of this digital copy is assumed by the recipient.

LAC holds enormous quantities of records for which the ownership and copyright status may be uncertain, either because of insufficient information or because of a mixture of public and private material, or of published and unpublished works. Users are urged to consult the *Copyright Act* and to seek legal advice when the interpretation of copyright raises questions. It is not the role of LAC to interpret the *Copyright Act* for users but rather it is up to the users to be aware of copyright issues.

For more information please consult the LAC, "Terms and Conditions" page: :
<http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/Pages/terms-and-conditions.aspx>

- 11 -

(b) To arrive at its price of \$3.9 million, the N.Y.C. had added the cost of re-locating the railway because of the seaway, estimated at \$2 million, to the value of the right of way, estimated at \$1.9 million. It was believed that the company would accept a lower price.

(c) The population of the area would demand the building of a highway to replace the railway. Unless the Ontario government was prepared to do this, it would be undesirable for Canada to acquire the railway.

27. The Cabinet noted the report of the Minister of Transport on the proposed purchase of the railway facilities of the New York Central between Helena, N.Y. and Ottawa, and agreed,-

(a) that the vice-president of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Chairman of the Federal District Commission be authorized to approach the Ontario government to see if it were interested in the construction of a highway over the right of way and, if so, what amount it was prepared to pay for the right of way; and,

(b) that the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority be authorized, if the Ontario government were prepared to build a highway, to offer the New York Central Railway the price of \$2.8 million for its properties, and to increase that price, if and to the extent necessary, up to the amount the Ontario government was prepared to pay to acquire the right of way.

Ferry subsidy; Pelee Island to mainland

28. The Minister of Transport reported that the annual subsidy of \$35,000 provided to the Pelee Shipping Company to maintain a ferry service between Pelee Island and the mainland had remained unchanged for three years. During that period costs had increased and the company had asked for an additional subsidy of \$12,000.

The Canadian Maritime Commission had investigated the situation and had recommended an increase of \$7,500. The Minister approved the recommendation.

An explanatory memorandum had been circulated.

(Minister's memorandum, April 30, 1956-Cab. Doc. 101-56).

- 12 -

29. The Cabinet approved the recommendation of the Minister of Transport that an additional subsidy of \$7,500 be paid on the ferry service between Pelee Island and the mainland

Ferry and steamship subsidies; revision procedures

30. The Prime Minister referring to the previous item, suggested that, once the principle of subsidizing a ferry or steamship service had been approved it might be more appropriate for the determination or revision of the amount to be decided by the Treasury Board. When a new question of policy arose it would be referred to the Cabinet.

31. The Cabinet agreed that the determination and revision of the amount of any subsidy to a ferry or steamship service, once the subsidy had been approved in principle, would be decided in future by the Treasury Board.

Proposal by Manitoba for a joint Lake Winnipeg Board

32. The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources said the Premier of Manitoba had requested, on several occasions, the Canadian government to join with his government in a general survey of water problems in the basins of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipeg, including a cost-benefit study. In view of the inter-provincial and international features, Mr. Campbell had been told that the Federal government might consider participating in an overall survey provided it did not include a cost-benefit study, and that the best way to carry out such work might be by establishing a board similar to the Fraser River Board. Draft terms of reference had been sent to the Manitoba government which had accepted them but still asked that a cost-benefit study be made.

The Premier had estimated that a minimum of 18 months and \$100,000 would be required to make the survey. However, the time and expenditure involved might be two or three times that suggested.

The Minister recommended that the Federal government join in the cost of a survey on a 50-50 basis, and that a joint board be established for the purpose of carrying out the work. However, he recommended that the government should not agree to include cost-benefit studies.

An explanatory memorandum had been circulated.

(Minister's memorandum, May 2, 1956-
Cab. Doc. 104-56).