

*Supply—Transport*

point of view, to make sure that in construction and in fulfilment, it abides by the building codes of the city, municipality or province.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Before the minister replies I should like to draw his attention to a resolution passed at the 1960 annual meeting of the fisheries council of Canada and to read it into the record so that it will appear with the minister's estimates. I hope he will give consideration to this matter. It is headed "Importation of Fishing Vessels" and reads as follows:

Whereas some processors of fish are suffering severely from lack of suitable fishing vessels; and

Whereas the federal government restricts the acquisition of the desired craft in the foreign markets through:

(a) The necessity of having to secure permission from the Department of Transport to import a vessel—a restriction which we do not believe exists in the case of instruments of production in any other Canadian primary industry;

(b) Heavy duties levied on vessels up to 100 feet in length when imported from most favoured nation countries; and

Whereas experience has shown that larger vessels are going to play a more important part in production in future years;

Therefore be it resolved that the Fisheries Council of Canada request the federal government to remove these hindrances to the adequate building up of the Canadian fishing fleet.

I am not going to elaborate on that resolution. I intend to bring it to the attention of his colleagues. I hope the minister will give it careful consideration. I hope he will remember that he used to do a great deal of fishing when he was on this side of the house and that he will do something to help the fishing industry.

**Mr. Hees:** I am glad to assure the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate that I will give it some serious consideration. In answer to the question put to me by the hon. member for Gloucester with regard to the studies pertaining to the Chignecto canal, I should like to report to him that my department has done a preliminary economic survey of this project. The Department of Public Works has done a preliminary engineering survey. However, there is nothing final that I can report to the committee as a result of these surveys so far. As I think I have indicated to him, I have always been greatly interested in this project. I have looked into it a great deal myself and I will continue to do so. The government will certainly give this matter a great deal of consideration.

In answer to the question—

**Mr. Robichaud:** Before the minister leaves that subject may I ask a question?

**Mr. Hees:** Yes.

[Mr. Winch.]

**Mr. Robichaud:** Is the study still under way?

**Mr. Hees:** Yes; it is still under way.

**Mr. Robichaud:** By both departments, namely the Department of Transport and the Department of Public Works?

**Mr. Hees:** Yes. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Vancouver East, may I say that this matter which he has raised is a technical one. It deals with questions under the jurisdiction of the national harbours board. I will discuss this matter with the officials of the board and later, when the national harbours board items come before the committee in the examination of my estimates, I will give him an answer at that time, if that procedure is satisfactory to him.

**Mr. Winch:** Yes.

**Mr. Cardin:** Before we go on to other matters I have a short question to ask the minister on this item. I think it is the only place at which I can ask him. Earlier this session the Prime Minister led us to understand that there was some department which was studying the feasibility of having a seaway on the Richelieu river from lake Champlain to New York. I was wondering whether the amount of money involved in this particular item, or some of it, is earmarked for that particular study of the Richelieu waterway. Perhaps the minister might also inform the committee as to exactly what studies are now being undertaken on this project.

**Mr. Hees:** We have given some study in this department to that project and have been in consultation with the Department of External Affairs on the matter. We have a continuing interest and will be giving it further study, but I am afraid there is nothing definite in this regard which I can report to the house.

**Mr. Chevrier:** May I ask a question following on what the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres said. The minister probably knows that the United States interests have, I understand, asked for an appropriation of \$600,000 for a survey of their side. They would like the Canadian government to spend not a similar amount, because it would not take that much money, but to put into the estimates an amount which would make possible a survey of the cost of the Richelieu cut-off. After all, that is all that can be asked for at the moment. What is this cut-off going to cost, and what are the economic advantages and the traffic likely to come from it. I think that is the main thing which interests the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres and those of us who sit on this side of the house.