

day issues as they present themselves and upon whether it has foresight enough to prepare for the future. With active sponsorship by the government of a project such as I have dealt with, other developments would naturally follow suit and these developments would bring in revenue to the government.

If the physical business volume is falling off it is natural to assume that it will be difficult to meet the obligations of government. The only way we can meet our obligations is by continued expansion from the wartime peaks. Otherwise a heavier and heavier load will be placed upon what industry is left, finally choking it off, and it will take another war to revive it.

To-day Prince Rupert is the best equipped seaport north of Seattle and Vancouver. It is the only northern port tied to the north by rail. It is interesting to note that on a map recently published by the *Christian Science Monitor*, pointing out the various ports that had been in key positions during the war, the port of Prince Rupert was mentioned while Vancouver and Victoria were not. These facts finally affect the future of trade and shipping in the north Pacific. Railroad freight rates to Prince Rupert and Seattle and Portland have been equalized, so that anything shipped out of the port of Prince Rupert going into the north Pacific would be naturally on a better competitive basis than commodities shipped through southern ports.

Richard L. Neuberger, feature writer for the *Portland Oregonian* and correspondent in the Pacific north for the *New York Times* states that strong political influences are being brought to bear against Prince Rupert as a port. With the centralization of economic interests in the south, it is quite natural to assume that these interests do not want competition coming from a newly developed area. However, with the critical shortage in raw materials facing the world to-day, it behooves us to think of the future of this country and act on its behalf rather than listen to the voices of powerful economic groups which are curtailing future economic development in such areas as the Pacific northwest.

I should like to quote from May-June 1946 issue of the *Nor' West Miner*, published in Edmonton, Alberta:

Post-war construction programmes as outlined by Ottawa number hundreds, and will cost millions of dollars; many of them are of real value to Canada's post-war progress, but the failure to include the project of completing this third transcontinental railway will prove a real economic loss to Canada. The time has gone by when it is possible for established interests such as Vancouver, Montreal and the great lakes to insist that nothing shall interfere with the present lay-out of carrying grain and

other products from the Pacific to the Atlantic. Canada is too large to-day to see development stayed. The Fort Churchill-Prince Rupert railway is the answer to many a reconstruction problem in Canada and is cheap at the cost of 18,000,000 dollars.

During the war the Jones Act was suspended, so that vessels of foreign registry, or to put it specifically, Canadian vessels, could carry material between Alaskan harbours. However, the Jones Act has once again come into force, so that Prince Rupert cannot be used as a port to ship materials into Alaska. Canada has been much too lax in not protecting its own merchant marine, and I am sure that if the Canadian government were to invoke such an act as the Jones Act, say for instance, on the great lakes, the Americans would take a much more reasonable attitude toward Canadian vessels sailing into Alaskan waters. For instance, the shipping charges on a car from the port of Seattle to Ketchikan are \$86.70. But if the same car were shipped from Prince Rupert to Ketchikan it would cost only \$40.80. With the port of Prince Rupert in this challenging position, why cannot the government actively sponsor and help them take at least part of the profitable trade from the south, so that the natural resources of the north could be opened up and developed?

Another hindrance to the development of the north and Prince Rupert as a port is the load line in northern waters, which works to the detriment of the development of shipping in those waters. Under the international convention on load lines, latitude 50 degrees to 60 degrees is considered to be more dangerous for shipping than latitudes between 40 and 50 degrees north. However, according to master mariners who are familiar with conditions in the northwest Pacific, in this location navigation is as good as if not better than farther south owing to the absence of winter fogs which are such a menace to the ports in the south. The effect of the present load line is to give the port of Vancouver an unfair advantage over the port of Prince Rupert because a vessel loading an 8,000 ton cargo is able to take 300 tons more at Vancouver than at Prince Rupert. A ship sailing out of Prince Rupert would have to get twenty-one cents a ton more to handle cargo than at Vancouver. This is undoubtedly one of the main factors causing the grain elevators at Prince Rupert with a capacity of 1½ million bushels to be almost entirely neglected.

The pilot chart of the north Pacific, number 1401, published by the hydrographic office of the navy department of the United States of America at Washington supports the argument that weather conditions along the