

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

exactly than was indicated by the rather vague reports which were carried in the British Columbia press what the government has in mind in this connection?

**Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, as I announced in my recent visit to British Columbia it is the intention of the Department of Fisheries to exercise some kind of control on the issuing of commercial salmon licences. On that occasion I also made it very clear that the matter was under study by the department and that this control will not be put into effect before we have had full discussions with the interested parties, including the fishermen, the industry, or the organizations in British Columbia which are concerned with the fisheries.

**Mr. Barnett:** A supplementary question. Could the minister indicate what form he has in mind that this consultation should take? Is the minister prepared to put forward specific proposals which can be examined by the marine and fisheries committee and about which representations can be heard from the various segments of the industry?

**Mr. Robichaud:** Before acceding to the hon. member's request I think it would be preferable for officials of my department to meet with the parties interested, as I have just mentioned, and then if desirable or if the decision is made to that effect the matter can be brought before the committee on marine and fisheries.

**SHIPPING**

## USE OF ICEBREAKERS IN ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert):** I have a question for the Minister of Transport in connection with his responsibilities for ice-breaking in the St. Lawrence. I think the minister may have been expecting a question along this line. Will the minister report on the charge that this continuous icebreaking in the Montreal area is causing a serious run-off of water and thus greatly reducing the low water level in that port?

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport):** That is not the question of which the hon. gentleman gave me notice in his interesting telegram to which I have already replied, but I would have been very disappointed had he not asked a question about this matter and broken the ice in this resumed session.

[Mr. Barnett.]

I may say that the principal reason for the icebreaking below Montreal, as I think the hon. gentleman has been told, every year, he being a faithful and assiduous questioner every year about this matter, is this. The hon. member has been told the same thing every year and it remains equally true every year, and it is that it is necessary to break the ice below Montreal to avoid flooding in the harbour. In that sense I suppose it does reduce the level of the water; but in the sense of reducing the volume of water in lake Ontario, I am advised by my scientific advisers that it has no effect whatever.

**Mr. Bell:** When these big ships cannot get into Montreal harbour this summer because of the low water level, I would ask the minister to keep in mind the reason he has given today.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I understand that the efforts of my hon. friend the minister of northern affairs have been so successful that it is very likely the ships will be able to come in just as well this year as they were last year.

**Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, would the minister investigate whether, in view of the low water levels, so much ice-breaking at this harbour is necessary? Because if the water levels are already low, then presumably at flood time in the spring the rise would not be sufficiently high to create any danger to the port, and therefore great amounts of money could be saved on ice-breaking.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I will convey the scientific impressions of the hon. member to the unhappy and beleaguered experts who have to deal with this matter.

**LABOUR CONDITIONS**

## MEASURE RESPECTING HOURS OF WORK, MINIMUM WAGES, ETC.

The house resumed from Monday, October 19, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-126, respecting hours of work, minimum wages, etc.—Mr. MacEachen—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

**The Chairman:** When the committee rose on October 19 clause 5 was under consideration. Clauses 1 and 3 had been allowed to stand.

On clause 5—*Standard hours of work.*

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Chairman, it was my intention, with the consent of the members of the committee, to make a preliminary