

ed over to a commission or leased or sold to some railway company, the condition of affairs must be changed? If this cannot be done and if none of the plans that I have suggested are to be adopted, perhaps the whole system might be treated as the Windsor branch has been treated. That has been handed over to others to operate, and we received 23 per cent from it. If the Intercolonial is to be kept in the hands of the government and under government management, then that management must be placed upon a sound and economical basis. Why, the Intercolonial is a laughing stock among railway men. As the hon. gentleman says, they like to see it not prosperous. Let us make a comparison. Two passenger trains a day start from Montreal or Halifax—at least this was the arrangement at one time. Two trains leave Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway for St. John, which is on the way to Halifax. And look at the hon. gentleman's statement as to the passengers carried by these roads respectively. Of the nearly 18,000 passengers carried only 1,500 were carried by the Intercolonial. Why is it that the Intercolonial cannot get its fair share of the traffic between Halifax and Montreal? Is it because the men looking after this business are not as capable as those of the Canadian Pacific Railway? A somewhat similar comparison could be made in every business arrangement to which the Intercolonial is a party. We in this portion of this country most certainly do not object to the Intercolonial being prosperous. Proper management of the Intercolonial would contribute to the prosperity of this part of the Dominion. It was true that the Intercolonial was built in the interest of confederation; it was one of the means designed to bind the provinces of confederation together. The hon. minister has quoted from speeches by Sir Geo. E. Cartier and Sir John Macdonald in 1864. Those speeches show precisely what the object was in building the Intercolonial—to make closer connection between the different parts of the Dominion. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has quoted from these speeches. Evidently the hon. gentleman differs with Sir Richard Cartwright, who states that Sir John Macdonald had nothing to do with confederation, but virtually opposed it. I am glad to have the confirmation afforded by these quotations made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) that Sir John Macdonald was favourable to confederation. The people of this portion of the country were perfectly willing to contribute their share toward the building of the Intercolonial. And, as I have said, and as has been stated again and again by hon. members on this side, the people here were perfectly willing that that expenditure should not be regarded in Jew fashion, insisting that we should receive a certain percentage on the money. What we wanted was and is a fair and equitable balance between the expenditure

and the receipts of that road. It is true, as the hon. gentleman stated, that there are other benefits to the country from the Intercolonial than the receipts from the road. But what the people of this country want is an economical management of the road, so that the receipts and expenditures may at least balance.

He reads a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy which he says justifies his charges on capital account on the Intercolonial. Sir, the letter read by him is a complete vindication of the course of the opposition, and justifies our criticism. The hon. gentleman says that the accounts of the Intercolonial are kept according to the rule stated in that letter. Perhaps they are at the present day, but in the past they never were.

I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the House adjourns, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that on March 6 last, more than a year ago, an Order of the House was passed for a return of certain correspondence and documents relating to free rural mail delivery, particularly as it exists in the United States. I find that the return has not been brought down, and I now ask that it be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might renew my suggestion to the Prime Minister, in view of what has just been stated, that the Secretary of State's Department should prepare a memorandum showing what returns ordered during the past session have not yet been brought down. It would be a great convenience to us, and would prevent some matters being overlooked.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the official report of debates of the House during the present session as follows:

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members, all of which is respectfully submitted.

H. GERVAIS,
Chairman.