

than are grown in those two counties, but they cannot get their price, and the potatoes have rotted there. The fertilizer companies have sold them large quantities of fertilizer, and they have the notes of the farmers, and, in some cases, even mortgages. The mortgages are being foreclosed, and the notes are being sued. The farmers cannot meet them, and what sort of spirit can they have towards a government that bargained away for the chance of temporary political support, their opportunity to sell their products in the markets of Canada?

I have no doubt there is distress in the West, and I would be a poor Canadian if I did not sympathize with the tales I have heard, but do not forget, hon. members of this House, that there is distress in the East and difficult conditions there. We are not all in the class of the financial magnates who have been referred to by some hon. members in this debate. We are not the moneyed power in the East; we are not the people that were meant to be assailed by my hon. friends. I am trying to represent, not as from that constituency, but trying to represent as from New Brunswick the pitiable plight of some other human beings who have been striving just as hard as my friends from the West to make a decent, honest living and to stay in the land where they were born.

Is it any better with lumber? I will summarize this. The low point of rates was on May 1, 1908, and the high point on December 1, 1921. The increases ran, according to mileage—I shall not weary the House with a long tabulation; I think they will take my word for it; it was all before the committee—the increases ran from 63 per cent up to 116 per cent. You are getting a pretty good increase even at 63 per cent. You can average it fairly, I fancy, at 100 per cent. Absolutely no relief either from this parliament or from the Board of Railway Commissioners. The board could not, and this parliament would not. This group to my left protests when we say that protection is a vital and an important thing for the industries of this country. I would suppose that my hon. friends would not take protection for themselves, surely, unless they were prepared to give it to other people; but so far as I have heard their attitude in this House, and I am saying this in all charity, they say to us as Conservatives: You are wrong; your protective policy is a fallacy, and we invite the whole House to join with us and to submerge the government by adopting an amendment which will go as far as it possibly can go towards destroying customs barriers. Somebody applauds. I did

not expect very much, but I know that is the attitude of mind of my hon. friends. We say: We stand for protection, and it is right. They cannot expect us to join with them and assist in giving them, or admire the giving to them, of protection that would mean actual dollars and cents taken directly out of the exchequer of this country. And yet that is the proposition that was made last year, as I understand it. Now, let us look at these things from both sides, let us try to be fair. All that we ask is that a consideration of our local difficulties should be had when those of the other parts of the country are considered as well, and we would ask that business ideas and the principles of fair play, rather than the exigencies of politics, should determine the solution.

I think I may revert for a moment or two to the general question of the railways, and as to how the interests of the Maritime provinces are affected. My attitude in this regard may seem intensely sectional, but I am under the obsession that it is fair. I trust that my remarks will commend themselves to hon. members of the House as being perfectly fair to this extent—that if we have in the Maritime provinces a port, or ports, capable of utility in the development of Canada and the handling of Canada's business, those are the ports towards whose development all the energies of our government-owned railway system should be directed rather than towards building up ports in foreign countries. I think that is a doctrine which can be readily subscribed to by any Canadian who is not merely seeking for some selfish opportunity for an outlet for his particular business, regardless of the welfare of his fellow men within the Dominion. During the last election, quite unfairly I thought, the party of which I am a member was bitterly attacked by the Liberal press in St. John on the ground that we had, by taking in the Grand Trunk, made Portland, Maine, the gateway of Canada, and the logical result of our action would be the diversion of all possible traffic to that port, and that it would mean irreparable injury to the port of St. John. If that had been true the same thing would be equally true of the port of Halifax; and my own view is that there ought to be no government policy with regard to the railways that would not treat one of those ports just as well as the other. Now what do I find this year? In a newspaper article published very recently I see that one Henry F. Merrill, the chairman of the state commission which built a large pier at Portland, Maine, says that in his opinion the simple matter of dollars and cents will defeat the efforts made