

before me some excerpts from a pamphlet entitled:

Notes from report on British and continental ports with a view to the development of the port of Montreal and Canadian transportation.

It states here:

Although Great Britain's sea power during Elizabethan times achieved a position that has since preserved her commercial integrity, Liverpool's maritime commerce was then being carried by 15 ships with an aggregate burthen of 268 tons. The sand dunes sloping to the river were undisturbed by artificial construction, and no shelter for ships existed. Nature has, however, been overcome by the courage, persistence and skill of determined men who, in the words of a former dock chairman, have made of Liverpool "a purse out of a sow's ear."

They had made a port out of the level sand dunes. I have another interesting extract here.

The length of the channel from the Nore Light to London Bridge is $47\frac{1}{2}$ miles, with a width varying from 1,000 feet to 200 feet, and a depth varying from 26 feet to 14 feet at low water.

And the narrowest width of the channel at Port Nelson is over 1,000 feet. Now let me give a further extract. This relates to Montreal:

In the year 1773 Glasgow was an important town, having less than 30,000 inhabitants. There was no harbour, the river Clyde being in places from 15 to 18 inches deep, and with only a "sensible" tide opposite the town. As far down as 12 miles below Glasgow the river was fordable. The river Clyde is now one of the great navigable highways of the world, 22 feet deep at low tide and 33 at high tide—

Almost exactly what the channel at Nelson is now.

—and its construction is considered a triumph of engineering skill. The creation of this inland waterway, with the resulting commercial and manufacturing establishments, is certainly a most notable achievement. It was the success of the improvements on the Clyde which prompted the improvement of the river St. Lawrence ship channel to Montreal, which now, as regards size and navigability, so far surpasses its model.

I quote this just to show that from the point of view of engineering the proposition at Port Nelson is one of the best this world affords, one of the shortest, deepest and cleanest channels you can mention off hand. As to ice conditions, it is possible to magnify ice to almost any dimensions, if you want to belittle this proposition, but I want to say that some of the busiest trade channels in the world have conditions which are just as black to the outside observer as anything pointed out by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. Let me now quote from Lloyd's calendar for 1924; concerning ice in the Baltic:

The obstruction by ice varies considerably in different years.

Just as it does in the Hudson bay.

The winter marks are laid out in November and December, and removed in March and April. In the northern part of the gulf of Bothnia, navigation is not generally open to sailing vessels until the middle of May. In the gulf of Finland navigation is usually closed about the end of November and opens late in February. The entrances to the gulf of Riga are usually closed in a few weeks, but the middle of the gulf rarely freezes completely. The river Dwina is kept open by ice-breakers. The earliest recorded date of the closing of Kronstadt is 12th November and latest 20th January, and the earliest opening 9th April and latest 24th May, Petrograd being a little earlier and later.

It goes on to show the ice conditions in a good many other important ports of northern Europe, and none of the conditions portrayed are any more favourable than the conditions portrayed by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. It is beyond refutation that in relation to this route there is no engineering problem whatsoever. The whole problem with regard to the Hudson bay route boils itself down to the navigation of the straits. Every reasonable man must concede that. There is no problem anywhere else.

Mr. SPENCE (Parkdale): What about money?

Mr. BIRD: That problem depends upon one's point of view and the object aimed at. I can quite understand that it looms larger in the mind of the hon. gentleman than it does in mine. That is explained by a difference in geography. The problem of the Hudson bay route, I repeat, is precisely that of the navigation of the straits. And we must narrow it down still further, for I do not think there is a man in this House who will deny that the Hudson straits are navigable during some part of the year. Everybody knows that; everybody is aware that in certain months during the summer the straits are as navigable as the Mediterranean sea. It is therefore not a question of navigability. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Foster) last night, and I was surprised to hear him suggest that this was all a matter of sentiment. You will have observed as I did that he was the only man who had indulged in any sentiment so far as the debate had then proceeded. In fact, his speech was all sentiment. I have read it again and I have yet to discern a single fact in it. He declared that he had gone through the straits and had got scared, notwithstanding the fact that he had gone in an ice-breaker. He went through the straits and was so scared that no money would ever per-