

plates only three-eighths of an inch thick, being subjected to treatment of that kind? It is preposterous. The Nascopie drew only about sixteen or seventeen feet of water, and its plates were so thick that they could resist any pressure that would likely be met with.

Now, we are told about the 200 head of cattle that were shipped from Churchill. Will the honourable member from Saskatchewan inform this House who paid to have the partitions built into the ship, and the other alterations made, so that the cattle could be carried?

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: Who paid for dredging the St. Lawrence river?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: The same people who paid for this.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: I cannot vouch for this, because it is only hearsay evidence, but I am told that cattle brokers in Montreal were a little bit sore to see the cattle going around by the Hudson Bay route, and they said that the cost of shipping them that way was two or three times the cost of the cattle themselves. In the first place, a ship had to be brought out. Who chartered that ship? It was an experiment, I suppose. I am told that the Government supplied all the lumber, because there is no lumber in the immediate environs of Churchill, and paid the wages of the carpenters who built the stalls in the ship. I would not mention in this House the figure that was stated to me as the cost of these alterations on the vessel, because it is so high. As I say, the cattle brokers in Montreal were a little annoyed, and they may have exaggerated the cost, but I know for a fact that it was high. The ship had to come out to this country in ballast. Every honourable member who knows anything about ocean transportation is aware that a navigation company does not want to have a vessel making a trip that will provide only a one-way cargo; in order to make the ship pay for itself it is necessary to have a cargo going and coming. Is it reasonable to expect that a tramp steamer would set out in ballast from Liverpool for Churchill on the chance of getting a load of cattle? No. She would have to be chartered a long time in advance. Well, I do not know who paid for the chartering of the boat that did come out. It was an experiment which, for the sake of the taxpayers of this country, I hope will never be renewed.

The honourable gentleman from Saskatchewan spoke about the navigability of the Hudson Bay. The tides up there run at

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN.

times as fast as nine miles an hour. The surface ice may be travelling at that speed, with the tide, but the icebergs, which draw anywhere from 400 to 600 feet, are in another current. You can hear them roaring five or six miles away, and they are called growlers. Every sailor knows that the tide changes on top before it changes below. The surface ice may be moving with the incoming tide, aided perhaps by a favourable wind, and meet icebergs that are being carried along by the tide from below. What would happen to a ship caught in that kind of thing? It would be the last of her. And it must be remembered that there is a change of tide four times a day.

D'Iberville, as I said before, went up there in 1684, and he continued going there until 1696, when he wrote to the King of France: "Sire, give me something else to do. I am sick and tired of taking Hudson Bay." So the King sent him down to Louisiana, where he lost his life. It is true that for over three hundred years sailors have been going in and out of Hudson Straits, but they are not practicable for commercial navigation. I have no grudge against the route, and wish it were satisfactory. However, any honourable member who so desires may go to Montreal and ask Mr. Reford, of the Reford Line, or anyone connected with the White Star Line, or the Canadian Pacific Steamships, whether they will charter a steamer to go up there, and they will say, "We will let you have a steamer if you will pay for it before it leaves here, and if it comes back safely we shall refund your money, less the charter charges." It is impossible to get insurance on an ordinary passenger steamer from Montreal to Churchill and back; and even if insurance could be obtained, the cost would be prohibitive.

I am sorry that I have taken so much time on this subject. I did not expect that my honourable friend would be speaking this evening, but since he did so, I did not like to let the debate go by default.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Horner, the debate was adjourned.

MARINE ICEBREAKERS INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. FOSTER inquired of the Government:

1. How many marine icebreakers are owned by the Government?
2. What are their names?
3. What is the gross tonnage of each ship?
4. Where is each principally operated?
5. What was the capital cost of each ship?
6. What was the total expense (including repairs) for operation during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1931, 1932, 1933?