

Supply—Public Works

that no less than 200 million bushels of United States grain will be transported through the seaway. If that survey is accurate, then it means that this grain will come down in lake carriers, both United States and Canadian, and provision will have to be made for the development of port facilities not only at Montreal but at ports beyond Montreal for trans-shipment overseas. These ports are places such as Seven Islands, Rimouski, Three Rivers, Quebec, Sorel, all the ports on the lower St. Lawrence.

What provision is being made by the Department of Public Works for port facilities at Seven Islands, for instance? I see in the estimates small amounts for piers and wharves but in view of the survey on the movement of grain made by the University of Indiana in conjunction with the Chicago board of trade I think the minister should give careful consideration to whether or not additional elevator space should not be built at these ports and whether additional facilities should not be built at the port of Rimouski, for instance.

Mr. Green: We do not build elevators, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Chevrier: It may be that the minister does not build elevators but if there is to be this additional grain movement additional facilities will have to be built over and above elevator facilities and related to elevator facilities are piers and harbours which come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works. That confirms my suggestion earlier that an economic survey should be made of the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on these areas.

Mr. Green: Of course that should have been done by your government long ago.

Mr. Chevrier: I thank the minister for that interjection. It was begun by our government. If the minister will look at what was done by the St. Lawrence seaway authority at the time he will find that a survey was started and, as I indicated in an earlier debate, the only reason it was interrupted was that the person who had charge of it was placed on the tolls committee. My suggestion made several months ago was that that survey be continued.

Another survey was started by certain economists at McGill University. They received funds from a United States foundation. Their survey had to do with the effect the seaway would have on the Montreal area within a radius of 100 miles. I do not know where that survey stands at the moment but nonetheless I believe that a survey

such as was started by the former administration should be continued by this administration. If it were the minister would then have before him a uniform plan to indicate where these moneys should be spent.

Mr. Green: May I ask the hon. member a question? Is he trying to make out that the former government started such a survey?

Mr. Chevrier: I am not trying to make it out. I said that an economic survey of the effect of the seaway on the various regions of Canada had already been started, that all the material for the survey was gathered at that time and that the person responsible for the conduct of the survey was appointed to the tolls committee and his work was interrupted.

Mr. Green: What department of the former government started the survey?

Mr. Chevrier: The St. Lawrence seaway authority.

Mr. Green: Again this has nothing whatever to do with the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chevrier: Of course it has. I am trying to indicate now that there is no plan in the Department of Public Works for the development of harbours along the seaway route. That is what I am trying to indicate. What I said was that I have no objection so far as what has been done is concerned. On the contrary, I have supported it because I believe that the seaway will bring tremendous development to the ports of Ontario including Hamilton and Toronto. But I am saying that the amount of expenditure by the government should also take into consideration ports along the lower St. Lawrence and what is in the estimates now is not sufficient. It does not take into consideration the development of seaway traffic because if the seaway is going to be completed next year and if there is to be the volume of traffic that the economists say there will be, namely 30 to 35 million tons, there should be development of port facilities not only with respect to the harbours under the national harbours board but also the harbours that fall within the jurisdiction of the minister. That is why I was saying earlier and repeat now that in order to spend the money profitably and economically there should, in my opinion, be a survey made of these ports.

Mr. Crouse: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Chevrier: Yes.