

An outlet would then exist for grain which, as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) has remarked, cannot find its way out through the lakes, because of the late maturity of the grain in that district. Therefore it must find its way through a Pacific port. It has that direct outlet.

In addition, grain from the Peace River country would have ready access to the rest of the interior of British Columbia, particularly the Cariboo and Kamloops ranching district which, at the present time, has to import its feed grain for winter purposes. Some of that comes from the Peace River, and it must go east to Edmonton, and then all the way back, covering that extra thousand miles.

So that we would have a two-fold advantage in the outlet. First, there is the outlet to the port, and, second, the outlet to feed the ranch animals of the interior of British Columbia. In addition to that, you would have a road crossing the main line of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific railway in the vicinity of Ashcroft and Savona—that is the east and west line—you would have the north-south line from the Okanagan, and from the interior part of Washington and Oregon, up through Kamloops and along the main line to Savona, joined by the new construction to the Pacific Great Eastern, and so right up to the Peace River.

So that you have there, with those two short branches only needed to be constructed, a whole new network of communication serving the lower part of central British Columbia and Alberta, and serving the northern part of Alberta and British Columbia in the Peace River.

So much for specific benefits which would accrue from the adoption by the house and government of the policy outlined in the resolution. I have suggested the Canadian National Railways, not because I believe this matter should be decided on a basis of public ownership as against private ownership, but simply because that railway happens to be there already. It has a line running through Prince George. Then on the north side of the river running down to Vancouver, the first line you would strike would be the Canadian National. Therefore it seems logical to use it.

I suggest that this be done now, because I understand that surveys have been made. It is said that the surveys show that the line would not be profitable in the immediate future. Nevertheless, as I have said, history has shown that the construction of railways in this country has always preceded development.

There is in existence, I believe, a report of a recent survey conducted as to the future of

the Pacific Great Eastern Railway system. The dominion government was represented on that survey. I have not seen the report. It may be that there are arguments in it which could be used to refute the present suggestion. Nevertheless I take the risk of advocating this policy now, although I have not read the report. I do that because if we have faith in the country we must be willing to take a certain amount of risk to build railways which inevitably must lead to a development of a vast and hitherto undeveloped part of the country. No doubt hon. members can think of many dangers and obstacles which would be encountered if this construction were undertaken. But I think I am safe in arriving at this conclusion: that there have been dangers and obstacles in the way of every development which has been carried on in this country and perhaps no more so than in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway. We admit that there are obstacles and dangers, but we say that our resource, our industry and our courage should be no less than those of the fathers of confederation who united this country by means of a great railway system.

Mr. MAX CAMPBELL (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, the first point I wish to make is that of need. Does this country or this district need this railway? I think that has been amply proved by those speakers who have already spoken in favour of this resolution. I wish to draw the attention of the house to the fact that as far back as 1910 settlers went into this area. In 1918 the government of the day put out a lot of propaganda to coax people to go into the district, and a lot of people did go in. Promises were made to these people by different governments in the past and by different members of government. I think it is high time something was done to fulfil the promises that were made to these people.

There are certain principles involved. The history of our railways is not something that many of us are very proud of. As I said, promises have been made by members of different governments and by different governments. Railways have been started and left half finished. Sometimes they were started at one end and sometimes they were started at two ends. As one hon. member said last session, sometimes they are started in the middle and do not get anywhere at either end. Last year we had a debate urging the completion of the gap remaining in our railway system. The promises which were made to these people should be carried out.