

Mr. FINN: On what commodity?

Mr. CAMPBELL: On wheat or any grain.

Mr. FINN: It is impossible to have a cheaper rate from Goderich to Halifax because my hon. friends opposite are contending that no grain is or should be going through the latter port.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No hon. gentleman in this section of the House made that contention. The hon. member is reading into the speeches of some hon. members here words that they never uttered.

Mr. FINN: Then I must ask this question: If the rate on grain from Goderich to Halifax is cheaper than the Crowsnest pass rate, why is it that grain has not been going through to St. John and Halifax for shipment abroad?

Mr. CAMPBELL: If grain is not going there that is not the fault of hon. gentlemen in this section of the House. That is the very question the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) asked the minister. Surely that is a proper question. I see nothing sectional in it at all. The hon. member is not in a position to lecture us for being sectional when he, and most of his colleagues from the Maritime provinces, introduces the question of the Hudson Bay railway and damns it not with faint praise but in the most emphatic manner.

Mr. FINN: All I do say is that from the time this question of building an elevator at Halifax was first mooted by myself two years ago, in the dying hours of the session when the morning light was coming through the prism glass, hon. gentlemen opposite—and they were not confined to the Progressive group; some of my hon. friends in the Conservative party who have since seen the light did the same—were taking exception to the building of an elevator at Halifax. They told us that it was impossible to put grain through the port of Halifax, that it was impossible to do anything for that port. We are not sectional in the east.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. FINN: No we are not. We can only prosper in the east if the west develops. But the central parts of Canada must also develop. If my hon. friends opposite feel that the panacea for all the ills of Canada is free trade, or something approaching it, I do not agree with them. I agree that we must have a national policy, a policy that will take care of the great industrial centres of Canada; but it must be a moderate protection with the

object of protecting the market of the manufacturer as against outside competition but not to be added by him to the selling price of the goods manufactured. That is the policy I believe in, and I believe it is the one that will build up this country. I have never objected to the Crowsnest pass agreement. I have always contended that it was a statutory agreement, and such being the case there was a moral obligation on the part of the government, and on the part of the courts and the railway commission, to carry it out. Now that the situation has been cleared up the duty devolves upon parliament to find out what is the best in the interests of the whole of Canada in regard to the equalization of freight rates. I say that the Crowsnest pass agreement is to western Canada what the assurances were, inferentially, and morally to the Maritime provinces when the Intercolonial railway was built, I think we may not be very far apart when the question comes up for discussion and decision. But I would not want any hon. gentleman opposite to think that I have any sectional feeling against the west, because on its great development and on its future the future of Canada as a great nation also depends. But it cannot be a great nation without its eastern and its western gateways; and if you close the eastern gateway and depend upon American ports there may come a time when they may not be open to you and then where will you be? You will be nowhere. I think that is a fair statement to make. I think that was the idea in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation in the building of the Intercolonial railway, the Canadian Pacific, and later in the mind of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he had the vision in the building of the Transcontinental railway, in order to connect the Maritime provinces with central Canada, the middle west and far away British Columbia. I should like to say before I sit down that I have no idea of being sectional; and any measure that will bring relief and development, and more contentment, happiness and population to our great western prairies will have my hearty support so long as I have the honour of a seat in this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am glad to have the assurance of the hon. member that there will be no sectional attitude adopted by himself, and I presume the same remark applies to his colleagues, towards some of the great problems awaiting solution in western Canada to-day. There may have been some sectionalism displayed in this quarter of the House, I do not deny it—