

maritime provinces might be revitalized. Maritime shipping would not be hurt and might be helped by trade with Churchill.

I now come to the question of the finding of the ships. Under the British wheat agreement our wheat will be hauled out in British bottoms. So we must interest the British government itself, the shipping agencies and companies, the cooperatives and export groups on the other side of the Atlantic. I said before, we had never had anyone vitally interested in finding business for the Hudson bay route. That situation is now to be changed. Mr. Graham Spry has been appointed as commercial representative of my province in London, where he has just arrived; and I think no one better qualified for that position could have been found. He will use his broad experience of affairs and his contacts within government circles in Britain to promote the trade upon which the development of the Hudson bay route depends; and Manitoba and Alberta, no less than Saskatchewan, will look forward with confidence to the success of his efforts.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has any figures to support what, to my mind, is his good argument, as to the amount of cattle that could be moved from the prairies through Churchill? On former occasions they did ship large numbers of cattle to the old country through that port.

Mr. KNIGHT: I dealt with the question of cattle.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did you give the number? I did not hear that.

Mr. KNIGHT: No, I have no idea what the possible export might be, but the figure would be easily obtainable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the government and to all parties in this house for support for this concrete objective for 1947. Let me summarize some of the arguments in its favour.

1. The movement of 15,000,000 bushels of wheat will provide a proper test, and is within the present capacity of the railway and port.

2. We are wasting the money of the Canadian taxpayers by not giving the route this test.

3. The small volume advocated will not compete seriously with the interests of any other port.

4. Movement in the quantity recommended would eliminate deficits and mean savings for (a) the Canadian government; (b) the wheat board and (c) British shippers.

5. The use of thirty to forty-five ships will provide a basis for reduction of insurance rates.

6. A full test of the port would reveal if there is need for extension of facilities or of navigation aids at the port and will add to our knowledge of radar and long-range navigation.

7. It is essential that the route be tested on account of the strategic importance of northern Canada.

For these and the other reasons mentioned previously I ask for what I think may be characterized as a cautious and reasonable test for the Hudson bay route in this coming summer and autumn of 1947.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, since reference is made in the speech from the throne to the relations between the dominion and the provinces, allow me to present my views which are shared by the majority of wage-earners in this country.

Everyone admits that we are now witnessing a tremendous struggle between, on the one hand, the wage-earners who wish to be relieved as soon as possible of the heavy burden of income tax deductions from their weekly or monthly pay-cheques and, on the other hand, certain wealthy people from Toronto and Montreal, supported by all Tory newspapers in the country, among others the *Montreal Gazette*, who do not wish to pay their share of income tax to meet the consequences of a war policy which they have themselves enthusiastically endorsed and the cost of which has been exorbitant to the nation.

Those same wealthy fellows, most of whom live in Toronto and Montreal, have rallied around Drew and Duplessis, in order to ensure the failure of the dominion-provincial conference and, in the event of their death, spare their estates from difficulties with the income tax division, should the dominion authorities be entitled to investigate what they actually leave, as compared with the amount they have paid in income tax for the past seven years.

Mr. GRAYDON: The common people are with Duplessis and Drew.

Mr. LaCROIX: That is what you say. Mr. Duplessis has stated in the Quebec legislature that the levying of income tax from a dead man is unfair, since he is no more in a position to defend himself. My answer to Mr. Duplessis is that some people have defended themselves so well during their lifetime by piling up colossal fortunes through non-payment of taxes—and this to the detri-