the work is carried out by the Federal Depart-

ment of Public Works.

"In commission harbours, on the other hand, a distinction is made between general works, such as breakwaters and dredging, and revenue-producing structures like wharves and sheds. The former works are the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. For the latter, the local commissioners are expected to share in the cost to the extent of their overall financial capacity and the earnings which they might expect from the particular facilities. Engineering would usually be a federal responsibility.

"In the public harbours in general, the Department of Public Works undertakes the construction and maintenance of structures as well as necessary capital and maintenance

dredging.

PRIVATE HARBOUR FACILITIES

"You will appreciate, of course, that there are many wharves in Canada, as well as several harbours owned and operated by private companies. In such instances, the companies are entirely responsible for their construction and maintenance operations.

"I think I should emphasize that the Federal Government is concerned with wharves for the use of the public, and not with the construction of facilities for individual private companies. Furthermore, dredging is not carried out at berths along private wharves.

"I am sure we all recognize the significance of our ports in the expansion of our country. For example, there is the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes waterway system, the largest inland chain of lakes in the world, which extends two thousand miles into the heart of the continent from the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This natural transport system, with later additions of man-made canals, has played a central role in Canadian natural resources from the earliest days to the present time.

SPECIAL CANADIAN PROBLEMS

"Our problems here in Canada are somewhat different from those in, say, Britain, Western Europe, and many parts of the United States. They usually have the advantage of a highly concentrated population and industrial complex serving as a hinterland for their activities. Furthermore, they can operate 12 months of the year, while our ports on the Lakes and on the St. Lawrence are restricted by the severe winters. This makes it difficult for us to obtain an intense utilization of our facilities. In making our investment in a harbour, we must allow not only for revenues to be obtained in harbour dues and wharfage rates, but also give particular weight to the probable stimulating effect on the local and national economies. Basically, the Federal Government is interested in promoting the expansion of any port in Canada, if this is justified in the light of engineering and economic reality.

"With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, many communities on the Lakes have understandably felt that their areas should receive major harbour works, with a view to attracting Seaway traffic. I think we would all agree that there is no doubt about the need for Seaway depths and wharfage expansion in certain harbours on the Lakes system, like Toronto, Hamilton, and at the Lakehead. All three have a hinterland engaged in overseas trade, and require appropriate shipping facilities. In the case of the Lakehead, the hinterland is, of course, Western Canada, for which this harbour provides the Seaway link.

INTERMEDIATE PORTS

"The present role of various other harbours is somewhat different. Many can be regarded as intermediate ports. They have depths running from 18 to 21 feet. This enables them to handle most coal and oil boats on the Lakes, lake package-freighters, and a large proportion of ocean-going general-cargo ships. Then, there are smaller ports, with drafts somewhat less, I recognize, of course, that, with changing needs, increased depths may be called for.

"In the case of all these ports, the question of enlarged facilities must clearly depend upon the potential need. Sometimes the point is made that, if the Federal Government would provide facilities, the traffic would come. This may be partly true. But I think you will agree that, if the Government were to go ahead with every such proposal, it would soon be involved in tying up very large sums which could be devoted to purposes much more imme-

diately in the public interest.

"Let us take a case where there is no large hinterland to absorb general cargo or to provide a large-scale movement of basic materials. Here the expansion of facilities would probably turn upon the needs of particular private industries located in the area. These would have to be industries whose operations were based on bringing in significant quantities of heavy materials for processing, or on the outward shipment of bulky products. Needless to say, the industrial growth of an area does not necessarily mean that barbour facilities are required. Perhaps the industries concerned are best able to carry on their operations by using rail or road transportation.

"I feel that, in our democratic system, the basic initiative for promoting the development of a port rests with the local people -- development associations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade and municipal authorities. If they feel that a harbour development is called for, they should make their cases known to the appropriate authorities. But these individual cases must be grounded on more than an indication of general interest on the part of some industry, some time, in some

harbour.