

railways operated in Canada. If this company had no port at Portland, I would be in a different position; but it has enormous terminals there, and so far as I am concerned, I believe that by proposing to come to Moncton the Grand Trunk Railway are simply dragging a red herring in front of our noses so that when they get their charter and have their line built to Montreal, they will give the go-by to the maritime provinces and say: Gentlemen, we have terminals at Portland, and we will use them. I can understand the promoters of this Bill being blinded by their surroundings; I can understand one or two gentlemen in this House being blinded by their associations with the Grand Trunk Railway, but I cannot believe that the ordinary member from Ontario or from the west can be blinded by such considerations. I quite understand that any Canadian in this parliament should think and think only of making the Grand Trunk use a Canadian port. The time has come, and parliament might as well know it first as last, when the people of Canada will not put up any longer with a foreign port being used to export the great products of Canada. I am willing to vote any amount of money to develop the west; but I want the western members to see that it is a disgrace to Canada to have the great products of the west shipped at Portland. What will the world think of Canada if we use a foreign port? It will say that Canada is crippled in its geographical area. It is a scandal to Canada, and will give a bad impression of the country abroad. Notwithstanding the fact that we have the best ocean ports if only they are exploited and used. The other day it was alleged in the Railway Committee that because Halifax or St. John was over 150 or 200 miles apart, farther from the west than Portland, that was an answer to the proposition to use a maritime province port. But I am prepared to show that two or three hundred miles at the end of a long haul is not the slightest objection. There are railroads in the United States which will carry the products of the country 3,000 miles as cheaply as other railroads will carry them 2,500 miles. Therefore, the gentleman who said that 200 miles of haul was going to destroy the value of a maritime province port as a great entrepot of this country, was not right in his statistics nor right in his heart—he was wrong at both ends. Now, Sir, I undertake to say that the time has come when this House should give the Grand Trunk formal notice, giving them one, two, or three years to make preparation to leave Portland. Is not this time for doing that, when they are coming to parliament asking us to make this system, which has hitherto been a purely Ontario system, a great north-western system? They are asking us to extend their system into the great territories of the west, to enable them to bring grain down

and dump it at Portland. In the early days when the Grand Trunk Company got its charter, there was not in Canada the national feeling that exists today; the provinces were not confederated, there was very little hope that we would arrive at our present stage of development, and the Grand Trunk was allowed to make its entrepot at Portland. But now that is all changed. Canada has become a great country stretching from one ocean to the other, and there is no reason why the Grand Trunk should not be told, if you want this charter, you will have to take it on the express and clear condition that you shall use a Canadian port. I am in favour of the motion of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), but it is inadequate. I do not care how many clauses you put into the charter, requiring the Grand Trunk to take their freight to a maritime province port. Unless the shipper routes them that way, it is no protection, because the Grand Trunk can give the shipper a wink, and say, route all your stuff to Portland. We must meet this question like lawyers and men, in a way that will make it impossible for the Grand Trunk to budge from a Canadian port. Turn this question around. Suppose the Grand Trunk came here asking us to make Seattle, in Washington, their dumping port on the Pacific coast. I would fight as strongly for you in the west as you should be fighting for us. You expect us to stand up as one man and say that our Pacific slope shall not be abandoned, and the United States coast used and exploited by a great Canadian concern against the interests of Canada. In the same way I want all the members of this House to stand up and say that the maritime province ports of this country must be exploited and developed for the purpose of rounding out this confederation. I am bound to tell you that the whole maritime provinces are aroused over this question. I was home two or three weeks ago, and I never heard a question so thoroughly discussed up and down the streets, in Halifax, in Amherst, in Truro, as this question; and every merchant, every workingman, every man in the streets, was of the opinion that the time had come when the maritime provinces should stand up for their rights. I remember when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the Conservative party with which I was identified, had to meet the charge of all that money being expended in the western country.

Mr. McCREARY. How about the Intercolonial?

Mr. GOURLEY. Of course, that was our answer. I do not care where the money is spent if it is necessary that we should have a national highway over Canada, and we voted in support of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not extend the Intercolonial westward?