

fering, that the passenger accommodation both on the Quebec Steamship Company lines and on the Royal lines, was none too luxurious. I contrast that experience with a trip I made last year to Bermuda in one of the magnificent boats running from New York, capable of furnishing a luxurious passage such as you enjoy as you travel across the North Atlantic to Europe. We cannot attempt to emulate such accommodation in our traffic with the West Indies; but I do believe that passenger as well as freight traffic can be much improved.

Another matter to which I want to refer is the Hudson Bay Railway—a subject that is not always congenial in this House. It is not a project to-day; it is a reality. The construction is nearing the Bay. One of the gentlemen who sit opposite, the right honourable member from Eganville (Right Hon. George P. Graham) selected the port on Hudson Bay. I am not personally prepared to criticize the change of the port from Nelson to Churchill, but it was my lot to sit with others on the Senate Committee that investigated the matter, and I can remember that the honourable member for St. John on my side of the House (Hon. Mr. Daniel) and an honourable member opposite criticized with great severity the selection of the port of Nelson, on the ground that it was wholly impracticable to make it a safe place for shipping, because it was too expensive to develop it and even more expensive to maintain it. There were many members of that Committee who, as laymen and landmen, were not too highly impressed with the port itself, and rather favoured bringing in a rider.

I think I know something as to how the port was selected in the first instance, but I am not going to deal with that aspect of the matter at present. Speaking purely from memory, I may say we had a rider which, while favouring the building of the Hudson Bay line, stated that in the opinion of the Committee the facilities of Fort Churchill had not been adequately inquired into. In any event they were not sufficiently inquired into by that Committee for the purpose of founding a judgment, because, with the exception of one or two, we had practically no one appearing before us who was competent to form an opinion on that subject. Honourable gentlemen all know, from the number of Railway Bills that are to come before us, of the great activity in northern Manitoba, and more particularly in northern Saskatchewan and in Alberta; and portions of northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan will find easier and shorter access to the European markets by the Hudson Bay line, when the

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY.

season permits it to function, than by any other route.

I know that some people think that railway will rob the East of a certain amount of traffic. Certainly it will, but the building of railways in that country, and the development of its mineral resources, quite apart from its agriculture, will bring to that part of the West a measure of diversification and prosperity that will more than compensate the East for any loss it may sustain in the transit of grain to Montreal. In any event, it is the experience of every country that somebody is hurt in the development of new parts and new industries. No one in this House to-day would criticize the spending of money in Vancouver or the sending of grain there. I can say, not boastfully, that I think I was the first member of this House to draw attention to the possibilities of the development of Vancouver and the Panama Canal as a route for grain. One objection raised was that the grain would spoil in transit through the Panama Canal on account of the heat, but speaking from information gathered from grain people, I argued that under ordinary conditions grain would not suffer, and I could see an immense development for that route. In the early days a small quantity of grain did spoil because the proper facilities had not been provided.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Ventilation.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: Now there is ventilation and grain can be stored in transit in such a way that unless it was extremely damp when shipped, and was not put through the dryer, as is often necessary at Winnipeg, there is no undue risk of its spoiling during transit. In any event, the Dominion Government has provided drying facilities at the head of the lakes for grain that is out of condition, and also internal storage facilities at Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton. I believe there are facilities at the port of Vancouver, and there may be also at Prince Rupert, as to which I do not know.

Speaking for myself again, I am not going to criticize the Government for selecting a port which is undoubtedly better than was Nelson, with perhaps some handicaps—a little shorter season, a little longer transit, and of course increased cost of railway construction to reach the new port because of greater mileage, plus the extra cost of transit of the train with its cargo from the grain fields to the port. But from what I can learn in the West I do not think that grain will be the only commodity that will be transported over that line in the next two or three years.