

I am very strongly of the opinion, and always have been, since I surveyed them both, that Churchill was decidedly preferable.

I consider, and have always considered that the expense of making a harbour at the mouth of the Nelson was prohibitive.

I have absolutely no financial interest of any kind in Churchill or in Nelson.

I think a basin sufficiently large to accommodate an enormous quantity of ships could be made at the mouth of the Churchill at very much less than it costs to build a harbour at Nelson. I think that Churchill is by far the preferable harbour from any point of view.

Ships have difficulty in getting into the mouth of the Nelson. I have been stranded thirty miles off the mouth of the river in a little boat on the flats.

Coming down on my last trip in just a little shallow boat we went aground out of sight of land. We had a crew of Eskimo who were supposed to know the river like a book and they undertook to take me in by the best channel they knew of, but we went aground about ten miles off the land and had to stay there until the tide lifted us off some ten hours later, and when surveying the harbour in the *Arlette*, we were anchored thirty miles off the mouth of the river and the whole district there is so shallow that terrific seas got up rapidly. Our anchors began to slip and we let our oil tanks run to prevent the sea breaking over us, and even with that we had to cut loose and go out to sea to avoid being carried on shore. That is the condition of things at the mouth of the Nelson and I do not think these conditions can ever be entirely removed.

We did not find that Mr. Bowden has said, the side shoals break the force of the waves. We found it extremely rough in the shallow water. When we were out on board the *Arlette* Commander Bowden did not care to bring this ship into the narrow channel. For three hundred years the Hudson Bay ships have been anchored out where we had. To this day they lighter their goods in little boats. I was there in 1905.

At that time the Hudson Bay people were still loading and unloading their cargoes by means of lighters. The Hudson Bay people make Churchill their main shipping point and distribute their goods from there to a great extent, because it is the natural harbour of the western coast.

Churchill is a perfectly land-locked harbour. I believe the Hudson Bay route for the transportation of western grain is perfectly feasible and very desirable. I think Churchill harbour is open for five months in the year. Observations have been taken for over one hundred years, and from my observations I believe that the straits are navigable for five months in the year. I think that is all you could safely rely upon. In some years it would be more, because the year Captain Guy came there on the 5th June he did not see a pan of ice. I would not count on navigation in June, but I think you could safely rely on navigation during July, August, September, October and November. There would be some new ice met with in November. That would bring it to the first of December. There would be new ice, of course, in the straits during the month of November, but the new ice is only light and does not endanger navigation, although it might delay it.

The land northeast of lake Winnipeg and down around Split lake is quite fit for settlement, and I observed not only in one place but in many places natural features of the country what geologists would call moraines, I think, immense gravel ridges constructed by the force of nature. They had much the appearance of great railroad embankments, principally they were constructed by the action of glaciers. I observed them particularly marked in the vicinity of Churchill. The sandy gravel part is such that it would not support timber. In many cases it was overgrown with timber. It would make ideal railway valleys.

The current in the Churchill river cleans out the ice as soon as it breaks up. It has no chance of remaining there.