

question? They have not yet had a hearing upon it, and I notice in the press of to-day that representatives of the government of Alberta are coming to interview the government of Ontario with a view to getting this question before the railway commission. What is the railway commission for if it is not to take up urgent national questions such as this, which mean so much to the working classes of this country? Yet no hearing has as yet been given by a commission paid and sworn to act promptly.

I support protection, Mr. Speaker, as a principle, not as a privilege. I believe that the proper application of the doctrine of protection will solve all the economic ills of every province in Canada from Vancouver to Halifax. It will solve the problems not only of the great manufacturing industries in this country, but of the agricultural industry, the great wheat-growing industry in the west, and it will solve the economic ills we have in central Canada and in the maritime provinces. I am not ashamed to declare myself a national policy Conservative. I believe that the protectionist principles of the national policy can alone draw together the varied interests of the Canadian people so that we shall become one great economic unit. These principles can join the mines of Alberta and Nova Scotia to the markets of Ontario and Quebec. Despite what Sir Henry Thornton has said, despite his sneers at the lunch-counter idea of reducing freight rates, I say here and now that Canada may just as well run a system of lunch-counter freight rates if that will mean keeping the Canadian workers employed at home instead of having to go to the United States to look for a job; we might just as well have this lunch-counter system of freight rates and employ Canadian workers as to increase freight rates and add to the number of dollars of Sir Henry Thornton's salary and the number of private cars in his service.

With a proper application of the national policy, the ideal of protection is the one true and enduring foundation for the future prosperity of this country. The national policy, rightly understood and wisely applied, recognizes no difference between the problems of war and the problems of peace. There is the principle of protection in war. All the resources of a country are mobilized in war time for the country's defence. We can apply the weapon of the tariff in times of peace to solve the economic ills of the country. When in war time we are invaded by a foreign enemy, our resources in men and money are mobilized and concentrated at a point where the invader

[Mr. Church.]

can be beaten back. In peace time we are invaded by unemployment, stagnation, and other economic ills, and it is then that the country's money and thinking power should be concentrated at the point of danger.

I am proud to serve in this House as a representative of one of the divisions of Toronto, and we are just as much interested in Toronto in the economic ills of the west and of the maritime provinces as we are in our own. I am as much interested in the ills of the maritime provinces and the ills of the western provinces as I am in the ills of York county. I support the building of the Hudson Bay railway on the protectionist principle. It is advocated by hon. gentlemen to my left who are free traders where other people are concerned, but protectionists where their own interests are concerned—free traders so far as eastern Canada is concerned, but protectionists where their own interests are concerned, and the Hudson Bay railway is one of them. I, Mr. Speaker, am a consistent protectionist. I support protection as a principle, and not as a privilege. The people of the west are content to leave it to the law of supply and demand to provide markets for eastern industry, but they are not content to leave it to the law of supply and demand to provide railways for western agriculture. I have been giving some thought to this question, and I am for the national policy, Mr. Speaker, even if the protectionist principle of the national policy requires the building of the Hudson Bay railway for the protection of the agricultural industry in the west from its competitor to the south, and to protect the farmer from loss of profit in marketing his product.

In addition, I am for the national policy of protection to the hilt as applied to the problems of the far distant maritime provinces. I believe that with a proper application of the doctrine of protection we shall be able to solve the economic problems of the maritime provinces. It was the free trade policy of the Liberal party that landed the maritime provinces in the condition in which they find themselves to-day. For forty years the Liberal premiers in the maritime provinces treated the resources of those provinces—the products of the sea, of the soil, the forest and the mine, the timber wealth of those provinces, their water powers, and their great basic industries—on the free trade principle. To this favourite a timber limit would be granted, to another favorite a coal mine, to another a water power, with the result that the Liberal party gave away the resources of the maritime provinces under free trade. They were like Santa Claus taking down presents from a Christmas tree. I believe that a proper