

you will have the same kind of trouble we are experiencing in other directions. What is true of the port of Montreal is true of the ports of Quebec, St. John, and Halifax. If you are going to adopt a system of this kind, you will be following the example set in the port of Montreal. The same is true in all parts of the world. The great works on the Clyde are managed by the city of Glasgow. The Clyde has been dredged; great docks have been built; it is one of the cheapest and best ports of the world, and the whole matter is under local control. The city of Glasgow is proud of the work on the Clyde, and the whole matter is well managed. It could not be managed in the same way from London. The same thing is true of the ports of Liverpool, London, Hamburg and all the other great European ports, which are all under local control. I have no doubt, with our vast distances in Canada and the difficulty of managing the port of Vancouver from Ottawa, it would be a great mistake to introduce such a system as is suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I have no desire to delay this matter at this time, but I should be untrue to what I know to be economic truth if I did not, in a single sentence, dissociate myself from the somewhat antediluvian views of the leader of the Opposition and associate myself most heartily with the up-to-date and progressive views of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), founded as they are upon a long experience of shipping and some knowledge of what goes on at the ports of the world in this matter. The views of the leader of the Opposition on a matter like this are the growth of protectionist sentiment. The whole question of how far we are to have shipping depends upon the extent to which we believe in a protectionist tariff, and I can quite understand that it will be necessary for the national government to spend and keep on spending money upon our ports if we keep up our tariff, because after you have spent as much as you like, unless you have a fiscal policy to expand the commerce of the country, your expenditure on the ports will be largely in vain. I do not want to elaborate this much at this time; but there can be no doubt in the world, on the part of any one who knows anything about or who has studied shipping and international trade that, on this matter, the views of my hon. friend from Guysborough are more progressive and more in accordance with the

trade facts of the world than those of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am quite willing to be regarded as antediluvian, if antediluvian means the ownership and control by this or any government of the national ports of this country. If that be antediluvian, this Government is most antediluvian, because, within the last five or six years, it has spent on the harbour of Halifax \$35,000,000, for every dollar of which the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), without the slightest demur, has voted, who all the time was, according to himself, piling up the barriers of antediluvianism and who yet had nothing to say against it. We all agree that, in that most magnificent harbour of Halifax, it was necessary to spend \$35,000,000 to make it more of a national harbour and for world-wide commerce. Since the war began, we found it of great advantage that we had spent the most of that money on the harbour of Halifax. If that harbour had been left under a commission, the great ships that came into Halifax and facilitated the transportation of our troops, could not have come into that harbour had it not been for the expenditure of that money. My hon. friend says that the nationalization of the harbours is protectionism. I do not know what subject I could discuss in this House on which my hon. friend could not find a corner for a discussion on free trade. I do not know whether I could discuss horse racing without his finding an opportunity for bringing up the subject of free trade in regard to it. If the harbours of this country are put under the control of local boards, that will mean that they will make those ports suitable for themselves without having regard to foreign commerce, and that would be along the line of protection and restriction. But if harbours are made free, nationalized in the fullest possible sense, with the money, intelligence and talent of the nation making them proper ports capable of receiving the commerce of the world, that would, in my opinion, be free trade in its best and most effective form, as compared with localism and parochialism in putting those harbours under the control of a few men who have nothing to spend. How many millions have we spent in the St. Lawrence river to make a port at Montreal? If the port of Montreal had to dredge the St. Lawrence, it would never do it. Nevertheless, every foot of water from Quebec to Montreal is essential to making Montreal a port. Montreal does not spend money there; the na-